



THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. X

JANUARY, 1943

No. 1

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Articles:	PAGE
Twelve Years of the Wandering Life of Buddha (P. C. Bagchi)	1
The Rise of Sukhodaya (R. C. Majumdar) ...	44
The date of accession of Jayavarman II (R. C. Majumdar)	52
Progress of Greater Indian Research during the last twenty-five years (1917-42)—A Supplement (U. N. Ghoshal)	56
Notices of Books:	
C. Sivaramamurti, <i>Amarāvati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum</i> (U. N. Ghoshal), J. M. Somasundaram Pillai, <i>Palm, The Sacred Hill of Muruga</i> (U. N. Ghoshal), N. Venkataiamanyya, <i>The Early Muslim Expansion in South India</i> (U. N. Ghoshal) ...	94
Editorial Notes: ...	102
Select Contents of Oriental Journals etc. ...	104
Additions to our Library ...	105

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs LUZAC & CO., 46 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.

Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or Bs. 6d., including postage.

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (*i.e.* Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan, and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

Membership Rules

1. The annual subscription payable by members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the Journal of the Society free of cost.
2. Resident members may have access to the Society's collection of books, pamphlets and periodicals etc. on application either to the Honorary Secretary of the Society or the Librarian, Calcutta University. The Society's collection is housed, by arrangement with the Calcutta University authorities, in the University Library.

Officers and Members the Managing Committee, Greater India Society, 1943

President—Sir P. C. Ray, Kt., D Sc.

Vice-Presidents—Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M.A., F.R.A.S.B.;
O. C. Gangoly, Esq., F.R.A.S.B.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S.B.

Hony. Joint Secretary—Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D Litt. (Paris.)

Other Members of the Committee—Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D., Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, M.A., D Litt., (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt., (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt (London.); Prof. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T. N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and in July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-IX already published.

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. X

JANUARY, 1943

No. 1

**Twelve Years of the Wandering
Life of Buddha**

BY DR. P. C. BAGCHI

A short Buddhist text entitled *She eul yeu king* 十二遊經 "Sūtra on the twelve years of the wandering life of Buddha" is preserved in a Chinese translation of the end of the 4th century A.D. The importance of the text cannot be over-estimated in view of the fact that certain portions of it have been the object of a number of studies by eminent scholars (Cf. S. Lévi, *Notes sur les Indo-Scythes*, *JA.*, 1897, I, 24; N. Péri, *Les Femmes de Śākya-muni*, *BEFEO.*, XVIII, II, 20-31; S. Lévi, *Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyaṇa* *JA.*, 1918, 83 (tirage); P. Pelliot, *La théorie des quatre fils du Ciel*, *T'oung Pao*, XXII, 97ff.; S. Lévi, *Devaputra*, *JA.*, 1934, 1-21). I have therefore thought it fit to take up a study of the whole text in all its aspects.

The *She eul yeu king* was translated into Chinese at least three times. The oldest translation was due to a Buddhist scholar named Kālaruci who had gone to China either from India or from the Indian colonies in the Far East. The translation was made at Canton either in 266 or 288 A.D. The ancient Chinese catalogues say that Kālaruci's translation was in existence till the sixth century, but it was subse-

quently lost. A second translation of the text was made at Nanking in 392 A.D. by Kālodaka who is mentioned in the Chinese sources simply as a Buddhist monk of foreign origin. It is not clear whether he was an Indian or an Indianised foreigner. Kālodaka's translation still exists. A third translation was made by Guṇabhadra who went to China in 435 A.D. and died there in 468 A.D. His translation therefore was made sometime between 435 and 468. Guṇabhadra's translation was subsequently lost (Cf. Pelliot, *Ibid.*, pp. 97ff.; Bagchi, *Le Canon Bouddhique en Chine*, I, pp. 115, 335, 386). Nanjio in his *Catalogue*, No. 1374, gives a Sanskrit rendering of the name of the text as *Dvādaśa-(varṣa)-viharaṇa-sūtra* which seems to be quite justified. But his English translation of the name as "Sūtra of twelve (years) going for pleasure" is not quite correct. It will be seen from our translation of the text that it deals with the preaching of Buddha during the first twelve years of his religious career after his attainment of Bodhi. I have therefore freely translated the name of the text as "Twelve years of the wandering life of Buddha" although literally it should be *Sūtra of the twelve wanderings*.

Although the translations of Kālaruci and Guṇabhadra are now lost, a fragment of one of them has been found in a compilation of 516 A.D. entitled *King liu yi siang* made by a Chinese Buddhist scholar named Pao-ch'ang. The fragment which is not very extensive contains a description of the different kingdoms in India. Kālodaka's translation, as we shall see later on, ends abruptly with an incomplete description of Jambudvīpa. The passage contained in the *King liu yi siang* forms a sort of *suite* of the present text. That is why Prof. Lévi (*JA.*, 1918, p. 159) expressed the opinion that the extract was really the last portion of Kālodaka's translation which was lost but was fortunately preserved in the present quotation. Prof. Pelliot however pointed out (*ibid.*, p. 104) that Pao-ch'ang, the compiler of the *King liu yi siang*, who lived in the beginning of the sixth century and was responsible for the quotation, was also

acquainted with Kālaruci's translation. It is not therefore impossible that the extract is from the earlier translation and not from Kālodaka's translation.

Pelliot's suggestion seems to be confirmed by another quotation from the *She eul yeu king* in a work of Seng-yeu who also lived in the beginning of the sixth century and was thus a contemporary of Pao-ch'ang. Seng-yeu's work is the *She-kiā p'u* or "A history of the Śākyas" which is a very extensive work. In the second section of Chap. I of his work Seng-yeu gives a long quotation from the *She eul yeu king* in regard to the origin of the Śākyas. It corresponds to the first part of Kālodaka's text which we have translated (see *infra*—from the commencement up to... "Śuddhodana. He was father of the Bodhisattva"). But there is considerable difference between Kālodaka's text and the quotation which shows that Seng-yeu like Pao-ch'ang had before him the earlier translation.

In regard to the *She eul yeu king*, a Chinese Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka, the *Chong king mu lu*, compiled in 594 A.D., says that it is composed of extracts from more extensive works. It is quite possible that the work was such a compilation but the sources on which it drew upon cannot be clearly traced. Some of the informations contained in it seem to be quite original and not found in other texts. The ancient Chinese authorities like Seng-yeu, Pao-ch'ang and Tao-siuan, while speaking of the origin of the Śākyas, consider the *She eul yeu king* as authoritative as the Āgamas and the Vinayas and as a matter of fact they have no canonical authority to cite for some information on the Śākya race except the present text. We have already discussed Seng-yeu's indebtedness to the present text. Tao-siuan (596-667) A.D.), the founder of the Vinaya school in China was a disciple of Hiuan-tsang. Two of his works the *She-kiā she p'u* "A history of the Śākya race" and *She-kiā fang che* "A history of the Śākya country" relate to India. The latter is a sort of abstract of the *Si yu ki* of Hiuan-tsang, whereas the former is of the nature of *She-kiā p'u* of

Seng-yeu. Tao-siuan refers to the *She eul yeu king* on several occasions in his *She-kia she p'u* in connection with the names of the members of the Śākya clan and their stature. It is therefore clear that in the sixth and the seventh centuries the Chinese Buddhist scholars attached a great importance to the present work.

The *She eul yeu king* does not therefore seem to have been a Chinese compilation as it is not mentioned as such by the ancient Chinese authorities. The fact that three different translations were made of the same text shows that there was an Indian original of the text. This original text however was not a finished work, but an incomplete compilation of the history of the Śākya race which included also a description of the Jambudvīpa over which the Gautama Buddha exercised his spiritual authority. In regard to the latter part of the work the original was either incomplete or mutilated. A glance at the text shows that it is composed of different elements. Some of which may be traced to different parts of the Vinaya and Āgama works. The elements of its composition are the following:

- I. The life of the Bodhisattva in the a-seng-k'i (*asamkheya*) kalpa.
- II. The life of the Bodhisattva in the Bhadrakalpa and the incarnation of the Bodhisattva.
- III. The history of the Bodhisattva and his family.
- IV. Buddha's predication during the first twelve years of his religious career—[this is the fundamental basis of the text].
- V. A description of the Jambudvīpa and the various countries and islands in it. This portion has no coherent relation with the earlier portion and comes in in an abrupt manner.

I

The importance of the *She eul yeu king* in the first place lies in the fact that it gives certain details of the life of Buddha which are not found in other texts. The legendary

history of the Bodhisattva of the *asamkheya* kalpa as given in the first part of the text must have been taken from some Jātaka which I have not been able to trace. The story of the descent of the Bodhisattva from the Tuṣita heaven is not found exactly in the same form in which it is given in the present text. The story of this descent is given in the *Mahāvastu* (vol. II, pp. 1ff.) in somewhat similar language. It is said that the Bodhisattva at the time of his descent on earth makes four observations (*vilokita*) in regard to the time, place, continent and the family. In the present text it is said that the Bodhisattva looked around from the Tuṣita heaven to see in which kingdom of the Jambudvīpa he would take birth. During his descent the elephant Yi-lo-man (airāvaṇa) drew his chariot. He is described here as having 33 heads. "Each head has 7 trunks of which each contains a lake. In each lake there are 7 utpala flowers. Upon each flower there is a beautiful girl." In the *Mahāsudassana-sutta* (*Dialogues of Buddha*, III, p. 204) the elephant-king is described as "seven-fold" -*satta-ppatittho*. The translators have explained this expression as meaning the "four legs, two tusks and trunk." But the real meaning seems to be the same as that found in the present text.

In the present text it is said that Buddha had three wives. The first wife was Kiu-yi (Gopī) the daughter of the noble Jalaprabha (*Shuei Kuang*—'water-bright') who was of the Sho-yi family which also belonged to the Gautama clan. The mother of Kiu-yi (Gopī) was Candrakumārī (*Yue-niu*: moon-girl). Jalaprabha lived near the frontier of the kingdom of Kapilavastu. The second wife of the Bodhisattva was Ye-wei-t'an (Yaśodharā) who was the daughter of the noble Ye-she (Yaśa). Yaśodharā was the mother of Lo-yu (Rāhula). The third wife was Lu-yi (Mṛgajā) who was the daughter of the noble She (Śākya?). The text further says that three different palaces were made for the Bodhisattva and each palace was provided with 2,000 dancing girls. This elaborate arrangement for the pleasure of the Bodhisattva was made because he was destined to be a Che-kia-yue (Cakravartin).

This tradition about the three wives of the Bodhisattva runs contrary to the Pāli tradition which has been so long implicitly relied upon. M. Péri in his masterly article, already referred to, has made a comprehensive study of all canonical and non-canonical texts relating to the wives of the Bodhisattva. He has shown that although one wife of Buddha either called Gopā or Yaśodharā is mentioned in a certain number of texts, in a number of equally ancient texts three distinct wives of the Bodhisattva have been clearly mentioned. Thus in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* there is mention of the three wives: Yaśodharā, the daughter of Daṇḍapāṇi, Gopikā, the daughter of Kinkinīśvara and Mṛgajā, the daughter of Kālākrama (?). In a life of Buddha entitled the *Siu hing pen ki king* translated into Chinese in 197 A.D. there is mention of Gopā, the daughter of Suprabuddha and besides of two other wives of whom the names are given in Chinese as Ching-ch'eng-wei and Ch'ang-lo-yi. In another life of Buddha translated into Chinese in the 10th century and entitled the *Chong hui mo ho ti king* there is mention of Yaśodharā, Gopikā and Mṛgajā. Thus it is the tradition contained in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* which is followed in these texts as well as in the *She eul yeu king*.

There is some discrepancy regarding the names of the fathers of the three wives. In some sources it is said that the father of Gopā was Daṇḍapāṇi whereas in other sources he is mentioned as the father of Yaśodharā. But the tradition is probably stated in the most correct form in the *Fo pen hing tsi king* which was translated into Chinese in the sixth century. It is said there that Mahānāman was the father of Yaśodharā, while Daṇḍapāṇi was the father of Gautamī which was probably another name of Gopā as she belonged to the Gautama race. Mahānāman is apparently the same as Yaśa of the *She eul yeu king* because the two names mean the same thing: glory, great glory. It is difficult to say why we get the name *Shuei yue* lit. Jalaprabha in the *She eul yeu king* instead of Daṇḍapāṇi mentioned in

other sources. But there is no doubt that they are the same person. Daṇḍapāṇi belonged to the Śākya race. Jalaprabha also belonged to the same race. It is clearly stated in our text that the name of the family to which he belonged was Sho-yi and that of his clan was Gautama. M. Peri (*loc. cit.*, p. 20) has taken Sho-yi as Śrāvastī. But that is not evidently correct. The old transcription of the name of Śrāvastī in Chinese is Sho-wei. Besides in two other places of the *She eul yeu king* the same name Sho-yi occurs. The first of the Śākya clan is called Sho-yi jen. Then again when the stature of the different members of the Śākya clan is described it is said that the height of the body of other "persons belonging to the Sho-yi family" was 14 ft. Sho-yi therefore seems to be an archaic transcription of the name Śākya. In old pronunciation Sho-yi was something like *śia'* (*gi*) (Śāgya < Śākya). Thus it seems that the noble Shue-yue (Jalaprabha) who was the father of Gopī or Gopā belonged to the Śākya family and was the same person as mentioned in other sources as Daṇḍapāṇi. The father of Mṛgajā is according to certain sources Kālākrama or Kālikā but according to the *She eul yeu king* he was again a She i.e. a Śākya.

The story of the conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana as told in the present text is essentially the same as that found in other texts for example in the *Mahāvagga* (I, 24), *Mūlasarvāstivādinaya* (Taisho, 1444) and the *Mahāvastu* (III, pp. 57ff). But *She eul yeu king* is the only source which states that Maudgalyāyana was a general of the country of Mi-yi-lo (Mithilā?). In all other sources both Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana are stated to have belonged to Brahmanical families. In the *Mahāvastu* the story is given as follows: Upatiṣya was the son of a rich Brahmin of Nālandā which was at a distance of half a yojana from Rājagṛha. He was also known as Śāriputra as his father's name was Śāri. He went to the houses of a Guru at Kolitagṛāma for the study of the Vedas. The Guru was a rich Brahmin of the Maudgalyagotra. The latter's son was Kolita. Upatiṣya and Kolita became fast friends. There were five hundred students but Upatiṣya

and Kolita completed their studies earlier. The two friends often met each other even after the completion of their studies. Once both of them went to attend the annual festival of the Giryaḡrasamāja. Kolita went in great pomp in a chariot driven by four horses and accompanied by a thousand servants. The two friends on account of their previous merit developed a dislike for worldly things and decided to take to religious life. They first became the disciple of Sañjaya Vairaṡiputra. They were however dissatisfied with the latter's way and soon separated. Buddha was then at Venuvaṡa. The Bhikṡu Upasena had come to the city of Rājagṡha for alms. Śāriputra saw him and questioned him about his teacher. Just after the first exchange of words with Upasena Śāriputra got the spiritual light. When Śāriputra came back to the place where Maudḡalyāyana was waiting the latter at once perceived the change in him. He then hastened to ask him: "How is your teacher called? What has he taught you." Śāriputra replied: "The Tathāgata has taught the dharmas which have a cause and also their cause. The great Śramaṡa has also spoken on its cessation." The two friends then went to the Venuvaṡa. Buddha foresaw that they were coming, announced it to his disciples and had seats prepared for them. After their initiation Śāriputra became an Arhat in 7 days and Maudḡalyāyana in 15 days.

The name of the Bhikṡu who gave the first information to Śāriputra is here Upasena, but in our text it is given as the "master of horse"—Aśvajit. That is the name which is also found in the Pāli Vinaya. The law of Buddha is described by Aśvajit to Śāriputra in our text as follows: "According to Buddha all dharma has a cause. (He also speaks on) its destruction, on the extinction of all pains and on nirvāṡa." It is not quite the same as that expressed in the famous verse—*Ye dharmā hetuṡprabhavā*...by which Śāriputra first describes the law of Buddha but the four Aryan truths (*catvāri āryasatyāni*). The scene is placed in our text on the road from Veṡuvana to Śrāvasti but elsewhere at Veṡuvana in Rājagṡha.

The conversion of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana took place according to our text in the fifth year of his active career as a teacher. The principal events of the first twelve years of his career are given in the text. They do not quite agree with what we know from other sources. According to the present text, Buddha left the house in the 29th year and practised asceticism for six years. He attained Bodhi in the 35th year of his life. From the 8th day of the 4th month till the 15th day of the 7th month he remained seated under the Bodhi tree. This was the first year of his active career. From this account it appears that the 8th day of the 4th month was the day when he attained Bodhi. It is according to all Indian tradition the full moon day of Vaiśākha. This can be the 8th day of the 4th month according to a Calendar (8th April) which commenced in January. He remained under the Bodhi tree up to the 15th day of the 7th month which according to the same Calendar would be the 15th July (Śrāvaṇa). He stayed under the tree for about 14 weeks. It was then that he started for the Deer Park to make his first disciples.

There is no confirmation of this account in other sources. All other accounts unanimously tell us that after the attainment of Bodhi, Buddha stayed under the tree and in its neighbourhood for seven weeks. It was on the last day, that the two merchants Tapussa and Bhallika came and offered him food. They became his first lay disciples. Buddha then thought of revealing his spiritual knowledge to others. He first thought of his former teacher Udraka, but he found out that the latter had died the previous night. He then thought of his five former associates of the Deer Park at Benares. But he left the Bodhi tree only on the full moon day of Āṣāḍha i.e. eight weeks after the attainment of Bodhi. This account is quite reasonable for the fact that the full moon day of Āṣāḍha was the beginning of the Varṣāvāsa. It was therefore necessary for Buddha, according to the ascetic practices of those days, to leave the open space and go to a place of retreat on that day. I believe there is a mistake

in the Chinese translation. We should have 6th month instead of the 7th month. The 15th day of the 6th month would correspond accordingly to the full moon day of Āṣāḍha. It seems that the year of predication was calculated according to the season of retreat (*varṣāvāsa*). As the second year in our account, too, commences with the arrival of the teacher in the Deer Park it is quite natural that the day of his departure from the precincts of the Bodhi tree was the full moon day of Āṣāḍha.

In the second year, Buddha converted A-jo-kiu and his friends. These were Ajñāta Kaundinya and his four friends—Bhadrika, Vāṣpa, Aśvajit and Mahānāman. They are otherwise known as the Bhadravargīyas or the Pañcavargīyas (*Mahāvastu* II, pp. 329 ff.). The place of the conversion of the Bhadravargīyas is wrongly given in some sources as Uruvelā (Kern, *Manual*, p. 24). The others converted in the second year were Pi-p'o-tan, 17 men including Kia-che-lo, the Elder Ta tsai, Eul tsai nien, Yiu-po-yi and the Nirgrantha Cheng nien. He preached the law also to 42 men including Ti-ho-kie-lo fo (Dīpaṃkara Buddha). This is not confirmed by other accounts. Pi-p'o-tan and Kia-che-lo are not known from other sources. The Śreṣṭhi Ta-tsai (lit. great talent) may be the same as Yaśa. Yaśa was a rich merchant of Benares. He along with his wife and 54 friends received ordination from Buddha shortly after the conversion of the Bhadravargīyas (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 24). Yiu-po-yi-
*Upaga seems to be the same as Upaka, an Ājivika monk, whom the Buddha met on his way to the Deer Park. Upaka was much impressed by the appearance of Buddha and made enquiries about the law followed by him (Kern, *ibid.*, 23).

In the third year Buddha converted the three disciples of Kāśyapa as well as 1000 disciples of theirs. The three disciples of Kāśyapa were Uruvelā Kāśyapa, Nadi Kāśyapa and Gayā Kāśyapa. Their conversion took place at Uruvelā where Buddha had retired in the third season of retreat. This account agrees with all other sources (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 24).

The happenings of the fourth year also are confirmed

to some extent by other accounts. According to the present text Buddha went to the mountain called Siang-t'eu (*Gaḥa-sīrṣa*) where he converted all kinds of supernatural beings, *Gaḥa-sīrṣa* hill is the same as the *Gaya-sīrṣa* hill of other accounts. It was not far from Uruvelā. According to other accounts, Buddha went to the *Gaya-sīrṣa* hill accompanied by the three *Kāśyapas* whom he had just converted and gave there a sermon on the *āditya-paryāya*. All his hearers there were converted (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 24). The principal events of the fifth year were the conversion of Sse-ho-mei (?) who is not otherwise known and that of Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana which we have already discussed.

In the present text it is said that in the sixth year Sīu-ta (Sudatta) and Prince Che-t'o (Jeta) made for Buddha a *Śaṅghārāma*, 12 pagodas, 72 halls, 3600 rooms and 500 towers. This is evidently a reference to the gift of the *Jetavana* at Śrāvastī by Sudatta who is also known as *Anātha-piṇḍika*. According to other sources the sole donor was Sudatta. He purchased the *Jetavana* from Prince Jeta at a fabulous price and erected a splendid monastery, in the midst a private room (*gandhakūṭi*) for the master and all around separate dwellings for the senior monks, cells etc. (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 28). The exact number of these constructions is not given in other sources.

The events of the 7th, 8th and 9th years, as recorded in the present text, are not quite clear. Buddha was in the country of Kiu-ye-ni in the 7th year. Kiu-ye-ni * Ku-zia-ni seems to be Kuśinagara. Buddha, we are told, communicated the *Pan-cheu-king* to eight men including the *Bodhisattva* So-t'o-ho. Two texts *Pan-cheu-king* were translated as early as the end of the 2nd century A.D. by the Yue-che Lokakṣema (*Hobogirin*, nos. 417, 418). The Sanskrit titles of the texts have been restored as *Bhadrāpāla-sūtra*. The name of the *Bodhisattva* is not known from other sources. In the 8th year Buddha resided on the mountain Liu and converted King Chen-t'o-lo—Candra. In the 9th year he was

in the lake Wei and converted T'o-kiu-mo. These informations are not confirmed by other sources. *Wei* may be a mistake for *an-wei* which would have rendered the name of the lake Anavatapta (Pkt. *anotatta*). Some of the legendary accounts would have us believe that Buddha went to the Anavatapta lake and converted the Nāga king there.

In the 10th year Buddha came back to Mo-kie (Magadha) and converted Fo-kia-sha. The person converted seems to be Pukkusa who was a disciple of Ājāra Kālāma. The place of his conversion is given in other sources as Pāvā (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 43). The event of the 11th year is not recorded in other sources. We are told that Buddha spoke on the past life to Maitreya under "the fearful tree" (?). From other sources we learn that Buddha passed some time in the Deer Park of a Yakṣa called Bhayaṃkara in the country of the Bhargas. The name of the Yakṣa is also given as Bheskala in some texts (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 34).

The main events of the 12th year, as recorded in the present text, were Buddha's return to Kapilavastu, conversion of Ch'a-mo-kie on the way to the city and conversion of the members of the Śākya clan. Ch'a-mo-kie may be Sumāgadhā, who was the daughter of Anāthapiṇḍika, married to a rich merchant of the Aṅga country. Buddha had been to the Aṅga country to pay her a visit (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 38).

In a résumé of events in the Chinese text it is said that Buddha visited 14 countries in course of these twelve years. There are three lacunæ in the Chinese text which have been indicated by dots in our translation. In spite of these lacunæ it is clear that the number of countries mentioned are only seven. The number 14 has been given by taking into consideration the Chinese translations of the seven names. The seven countries visited by Buddha are the following: (1). The country of king Po-sse-jo (Pasenādi-Prasenajit) i.e. Kosala. The name of Prasenajit is translated as *ho-yue* "joyful." The old transcription Po-sse-jo can be restored only as *Pasena*. This was understood by the Chinese translator as

“joyful” (*-prasanna*). (2). *Kia-wei-lo-yue*—*Kapilavastu*—the translation of the name as *miao-to* “good merit” is quite regular (Rosenberg, *Vocabulary*, p. 130). (3). *Sho-wei*—*Śrāvasti*; the Chinese translation—*wu wu pu yü* literally means *abhāva-niḥsattva* “without substance, without character”. This was the translation of a symbolical name of *Śrāvasti* as in the case of *Kapilavastu*. In the case of *Vaiśālī* also we will find such a name. (4). *Wei-ye-li*—*Vaiśālī*, there are two Chinese translations of the name. *Kuang-ta* “vast” is the literal translation of the name. The other *tu sheng sse* “saving from birth and death” is, I believe, the translation of the symbolical name. (5). *Lo-yue-ki* is *Rājagṛha*. The Chinese translation of the name as *wang she* “king’s house” is more commonly found in the texts than the transcribed name. (6). *Kiu-leu* is evidently a transcription of the name *Kuru*. The translation of the name as *che she kuo* “the country of the masters of knowledge” is a reference to the old tradition that the *Kuru* country was famous for its lore of knowledge. (7). *Po-lo-nai*—*Vārāṇasī*. *Lu-ye*—“Deer Park” (*Mṛgadāva*) is wrongly given as translation of the name of the country.

It may be reasonably questioned why the present text gives a description of the activities of Buddha only for twelve years. The cycle of events as described here is a perfectly complete cycle. After Buddha had taken the decision of preaching his law to others he set out on his self-imposed errand, visited all the principal countries in North-India and ultimately returned to the country of his nativity where he preached his law to his own people and converted them. The subsequent career of Buddha as described in other sources is nothing but a repetition of visits to the same old centres and conversion of other peoples who did not play any significant part in the history of the faith. Were these twelve years the whole career of Buddha according to the earlier sources?

It may be pointed out that even according to other sources there is a complete blank in the career of Buddha for twenty-

three years. There is in these sources a narration of events up to the 20th year of Buddha's religious career. There is then a blank of 23 years. After that, there is a resumption of the account of what happened during the last eight years of Buddha's life (Kern, *ibid.*, p. 38)

The blank is explained in the following manner in an account of the *Fo shuo pa ta ling t'a hao king* which I translated some time ago (*J. H. Q.* XVII, pp. 223 ff.). The text was rendered into Chinese by Fa-t'ien towards the end of the 10th century. The text contains the following gāthās :

"Twenty-nine years I passed in the royal palace. For six years I practised asceticism on the snowy mountain. For five years I converted men in the city of Rājagṛha. For four years I stayed in the *Pi-sha* forest. For two years I stayed peacefully on the *Jo-li-yen* (Nairāñjanā). For twenty-three years I stayed in Śrāvastī. In the city of Vaiśālī, in the Mṛgadāva, *Mo-kiu-li* and Trayastrimśa heaven, *She-shu-na* and *Kiao-shen-mi* (Kauśāmbi) on the peak of the Ratnacaitya mountain and in wilderness, in the town of *Wei-nu*, *Fei-lan-ti*, in the city of *Kia-pi*, the capital of king Suddhodana, in each of these places the Śākya Tathāgata travelled and stayed for one year—thus eighty years he lived in this world. Afterwards the *meu-ni* (muni) entered Nirvāṇa.

Pi-sha (wrongly printed in the article referred to, as *Pihha*) seems to be the same as Bheskala forest which belonged to the country of the Bhargas. *Mo-kiu-li* may be Mucalinda, the Nāga, in whose place Buddha stayed for some time. *She-shu-na* is the Śimśumārāgiri, the capital of the Bhargas. *Wei-nu* may be Veṇuvana. *Fei-lan-ti* is Verañja. The blank of 23 years is explained here as a "stay in Śrāvastī". According to this account the first period consists of the activities during the first eleven years after the attainment of Bodhi. It was followed by 23 years' stay in Śrāvastī. The last period consists of eight or nine years. There is a mistake

in the calculation by one or two years. The first period of active career probably lasted for eleven years. Then came the prolonged stay of twenty-three years at Śrāvastī. That would make in all 80 years ($29+6+11+23+9+2=80$ years). From this account too it appears that the period of Buddha's activities lasted for twelve years including the year of his attainment of Bodhi. It was followed by the long period of blank. The account of the *She-eul-yeu-king* in this regard seems to have a special significance.

II

The text contains the first literary mention in a text of Indian origin of *Devaputra* in the special sense in which the Kushans used it in India. In the last section of the text which concerns Jambudvīpa it is said that there are four Devaputras—"Sons of Heaven" (Chinese T'ien-tseu). "In the East there is the Devaputra of the Tsin. The people are prosperous there. In the South there is the Devaputra of the country of T'ien-chu. The country is much noted for its elephants. In the West there is the Devaputra of Ta-ts'in. The country produces gold, silver, gems and jade. In the North-West there is the Devaputra of the Yue-che. The country produces many good horses." Thus the four countries which possessed Devaputras were Tsin—China, T'ien-chu—India, Ta-ts'in—Roman Orient, and the Yue-che country or the Indo-Scythian Empire.

It is now admitted that the Kushan Emperors borrowed the title Devaputra—"Son of Heaven" from China. Kaniṣka, Huviṣka, Vāsudeva, all use this title. The kings of Khotan who were most probably connected with the Kushans use the same title in the Kharoṣṭhi documents of the Stein Collection. Tien-tseu or the 'Son of Heaven' was the regular title of the Emperor of China. It did not have that special significance anywhere else. The Kushan Emperors were the first to establish contact with China, Persia and the Roman Empire and to use titles signifying the Imperial dignity in all the countries with which they entertained relations.

As the Emperor of India they used the common Indian title *mahārāja*. But they also borrowed the title *rājātirāja* "the king of kings" from Iran, the title of *devaputra*—"the son of Heavens" from China and most probably the title of *kaisara* (Cæsar) from the Roman Empire. The reading of the last title which is found only in the Ara Inscription of Vajeshkaputra Kaniṣka (Konow, *Corpus*, p. 165) is doubtful. It is however quite probable that a great Kushan king would use such a title, as it was the last of a series of titles known to him signifying the Imperial dignity.

A number of references to the Kushan use of the title of Devaputra found in almost contemporary literature has been cited by Profs. Lévi and Pelliot. The commentary of the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* by Nāgārjuna which has been preserved in a Chinese translation of Kumārajīva under the title of *Ta che tu luen* mentions four kinds of gods—"gods by name, gods by birth, gods by purity, and gods by natural purity." The text further says that the god by name "is now the king whom one calls Devaputra." In a Chinese text entitled *Nan cheu yi wu che* compiled by Wan-chen in the 3rd century A.D., now known only from some quotations in other texts, it is clearly stated that "the king in the Yue-che country is called the 'son of Heaven'—(Devaputra)." Lastly I believe that the same tradition is recorded, but in a slightly altered form, by Hiuan-tsang. While speaking about the kingdom of Kie-p'an-t'o (Tash Kurghan) in the Pamirs, the pilgrim tells us that the rulers of the country styled themselves Chi-na-t'i-p'i-k'iu-tan-lo (Cina-deva-gotra) as they claimed descent from a Chinese lady and the sun-god (Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 286; Beal—*Buddhist Records*, II, p. 300). Devagotra in this case is reminiscent of Devaputra, the title used by the Kushans. Tash Kurghan which is on the way from Kashmir to Kashgar was certainly one of the most important Yue-che outposts towards Central Asia. It is therefore quite natural that even in the 7th century a petty ruling dynasty in the inaccessible mountains would still call themselves Devaputra and claim through it a relation-

ship with China. Chi-na-t'i-p'o-k'iu-tan-lo may be as well a mistake for—t'i-p'o-fo-tan-lo (Devaputra) which Yi-tsing mentions on two occasions. In one of his works (Chavannes, *Mémoire sur les Religieux éminents*, p. 56, n. 3) he refers to T'i-p'o-fo-tan-lo (Devaputra) as the title of the Emperor who resided at the Chinese capital. In another work (*Records of the Buddhist Practices*, Takakusu, p. 136) he explains it more fully. "When they (Indians) hear that one is a priest of Devaputra (T'i-p'o-fo-tan-lo) all pay great honour and respect, wherever one goes. Deva (t'i-po) means 'heaven' (t'ien) and putra (fo tan lo) means 'son' (tseu); the priest of the Devaputra is more fully 'One who has come from the place where dwells the Son of Heaven of Cina (China).'"

Devaputra in this special sense is used in a section of the *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* which has been discussed in detail by Prof. Lévi and compared by him with its different Chinese and Tibetan translations. The most significant lines are the following :

*kiṃ cāpi mānuṣe loke jāyate śriyate nṛpaḥ
api vai devasambhūto devaputraḥ sa ucyate.
trayastrimśair devarājendrain bhāgo datto*

"Although he is born and although he flourishes in the world of men but as his existence depends on the gods he is called *devaputra*. The thirty-three greatest kings of gods all give him a portion each..."

Prof. Lévi has shown that the Brahmanical texts like the *Manusmṛitā* and the *Mahābhārata* contain similar ideas on the divine origin of royalty, but there is no mention of the title *devaputra*. Kaṇṣka was a patron of Mahāyāna. The *Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra* is a very ancient Mahāyāna work. The special importance which it attaches to the title *devaputra* in the sense in which the Kushan emperors used it shows that the text was compiled in the Kushan period.

The title *devaputra* according to Prof. Lévi was introduced in India by the Yue-che through an Iranian medium. "The Yue-che emperors", Prof. Lévi says, "before

introducing in India the Imperial title which they had picked up from the Chinese in course of their periplegations in order to round the Pamir, had been in contact, as well as in conflict, with the people speaking an Iranian language who extended up to Central Asia. They were specially in contact with the Arsacidan dynasty, the successors of the Seleucides, who had extended their empire up to the frontiers of India. It was certainly in this region that an Iranian translation of the Chinese title *t'ien-tseu* was elaborated and fixed under the form *bagpuhr*". This Arsacidan form *bagpuhr* was according to Lévi, the intermediary through which the Chinese *t'ien-tseu* became *devaputra*.

But the presence of the title *bagpuhr* in Iranian can be ascertained only through a Sogdian intermediary *βγpwr* which occurs in a solitary old Sogdian letter which was found in a mutilated condition. The Arab geographers and travellers of later times mention the title either as *baghbur* or as *faghfur* which must have reached them through Persian sources. But the intermediate stages are unknown. Besides the Chinese sources which alone speak of the migration of the Yue-ches to the Oxus valley and of their ultimate conquest of India do not say that the earlier Yue-che rulers used the title. The Kushans only used this title after the conquest of India and after the foundation of an empire which extended from the Hindukush up to Eastern India. Devaputra was not the only title which they used. They used besides, the titles of Mahārāja, Rājātirāja and probably also Kaisara. It was therefore the deliberate expression of the sentiment of vainglory on the part of the first Kushan Emperor of India. It is thus more likely that 'Devaputra' was not conceived after an Iranian original like *bagpuhr* but directly after the Chinese tradition. The Kushan Emperors of India had direct relation with China. It must be remembered that the ancient Khotanese rulers who had Kushan affinities use the Indian title *devaputra* in spite of the fact that the local language of Khotan was a form of Eastern Iranian. It is therefore more probable that the Iranian

bagpuhr instead of being the basis of the Sanskrit *devaputra* was an adaptation of the Sanskrit title.

It is true that the passage of the *She eul yeu king* which we have already quoted and which mentions the four *Devaputras* of the Jambudvīpa places the Yue-che country outside India. It locates China in the East, India in the South, Ta-ts'in (Roman Orient) in the West and the Yue-che country in the North-West. But the starting point of this geographical distribution is not clear. Ta-ts'in was in the West and China in the East in relation to Iran. But how could the Yue-che country be placed in the North-West in the same sense. The importance lies not in the geography but in the fact that the compiler of the *She eul yeu king* knew that the Emperor of China was known as *Devaputra* and so also the Yue-che (Kushan) Emperors of India. For him *devaputra* was a title which conveyed the sense of a paramount ruler and that is why he used it to describe the four great rulers of the world known to him.

The "theory of the four sovereigns" has been discussed by Prof. Pelliot in great detail in his article which I have already mentioned. He has quoted various texts in which this theory has been elaborated and has also tried to trace similar notions in India but without much success. The Chinese and Arabic sources, as he has shown, are full of references to this theory but such references in Indian sources are very meagre.

Hsuan-tsang in the introduction to his *Si-yu-ki* first of all gives a description of the Buddhist cosmology and then introduces the story of the four great sovereigns of Jambudvīpa and their respective countries. The Buddhist cosmology as given by Hsuan-tsang is the same as found in other Buddhist texts, for example in the *Abhidharmakośa* (Vallée Poussin, III, pp. 45ff.). According to this cosmology there are four islands: Videha in the East, Jambu in the South, Godāniya in the West and Kuru in the North. The king who rules over all the four islands is called "Gold Wheel king" (*suvarṇa-cakravartin*). The king who rules over the

three islands excepting the northern one is called the "Silver Wheel king" (*raupya-caṣṭarvartin*). The ruler of two islands—Jambudvīpa and Videha are called "Copper Wheel king" (*tāmra-caṣṭravartin*). The "Iron Wheel king" (*ayas-caṣṭarvartin*) bears sway only on the Jambudvīpa. How this gradual decay in the sovereign power of the kings took place has been told in the *She eul yeu king* (§. II) with reference to the kings of the Śākya race. Destruction of life was the cause which gradually brought about this decadence. It also shortened the life of the rulers and brought diseases on earth. While speaking about the Cakravartin rulers the *She eul yeu king* however speaks of the four heavens (*t'ien*) instead of the four dvīpas. The Iron Wheel king is according to it the king of the Southern Heaven which corresponds to the Southern Island or Jambudvīpa of other sources.

Hsuan-tsang then speaks of the four great sovereigns of the Jambudvīpa. The information given by him is not found in any other Buddhist cosmological source. He tells us (Watters, I, pp. 35ff.) that when the last Cakravartin king (i.e. the Iron Wheel king) ceased to exist, the Jambudvīpa was divided amongst four sovereigns. These four sovereigns were the Elephant-Lord (*Gajapati*) in the South, the Lord of Precious substances (*Ratnapati*) in the West, the Horse-Lord (*Aśvapati*) in the North and Man-Lord (*Narapati*) in the East. Watters has summarised the passage thus:

"In the South is the Elephant-Lord whose territory has a hot moist climate with people energetic, devoted to study and addicted to magical arts, wearing garments which cross the body and leave the right shoulder bare: their hair is made into a topknot in the middle and hangs down on the sides: they associate in towns and live in houses of several storeys. In the West is the Lord of Precious Substances who rules over the sea abounding in pearls, whose subjects are rude and covetous, wear short coats fastened to the left, cut their hair short and have long mustachios; they live in towns also and are traders. The Horse-Lord rules in the North; his

country is very cold yielding horses, and with inhabitants of a wild fierce nature who commit murder without remorse, they live in felt tents and are migratory herdsmen. In the East is the Man-Lord who has a well-peopled territory with a genial climate where all good manners and social virtues prevail and the people are attached to the soil."

Tao-siuan, who summarised the *Si-yu-ki* in his *She kia fang che*, has identified the four sovereigns of the Jambudvīpa mentioned by Hiuan-tsang but in rather vague terms. He identifies the Elephant-Lord (*Gajapati*) with the king of India, the Lord of Precious Substances (*Ratnapati*) with the king of Hu (the barbarians), the Horse-Lord (*Aśvapati*) with the T'u-kiue (Turks), and the Man-Lord (*Narapati*) with China. He adds that in the country of the Elephant-Lord the king rules the country with the help of "soldiers mounted on elephants." In a later work named the *Siu kao seng chuan* (compiled between 664 and 667) Tao-siuan gives a more precise identification of the four regions while narrating the biography of Hiuan-tsang. He says that in India there is a tradition that Jambudvīpa is governed by four kings. "The East is called Che-na (Cina)—the lord of the country is the king over men. The West is called Po-sse (Persia), the lord of the country is the king over gems. The South is called Yin-tu (India)—the lord of the country is the king over elephants." The North is called Hien-yun (Hiong-nu, i.e. Turks etc.)—the lord of the country is the king over horses".

It is quite clear from this that Tao-siuan was trying to elaborate the information supplied by Hiuan-tsang either verbally or through the *Si-yu-ki*, in the light of the geographical knowledge then possessed by the Chinese scholars. We have already seen that Tao-siuan knew the *She eul yeu king* and utilised it on several occasions for his compilation of the *She-kia she p'u*. But he does not follow the identification of regions as given in that text—China in the East (noted for the prosperity of its people), T'ien-chu (India) in the south (noted for its elephant), Ta-ts'in (Roman Orient) in the West

(noted for its precious substances), and Yue-che in the North-West (noted for its horses). The reason is quite evident. Ta-ts'in and Yue-che had ceased to exist in the time of Hiuan-stang and Tao-siuan. So instead of these he gives two names of real significance in his time—Po-sse (Persia) in the West and T'u-kiue (Turks) in the North. Therefore the theory of the four sovereigns—*Narapati*, in the East, *Gajapati* in the South, *Aśvapati* in the North (or North-West, and *Ratnapati* in the West, is the most important issue of what has been said. Their association with certain geographical areas has not the same importance. The theory was used by each author in his own way. The Arab geographers of later times, as Prof. Pelliot has shown, did the same thing. Two important texts have been cited by Prof. Pelliot in this respect. In a text dated 851 attributed to one Sulayman the following statement occurs:

"The people of India and China are of unanimous opinion regarding the fact that the (great) kings of the earth are four in number. The foremost of the four kings according to them is the king of the Arabs (i.e. the Khalif of Baghdad). The Indians and the Chinese agree without any contradiction as to the fact that the king of the Arabs is the greatest of kings, the richest and the most magnificent. He is the king of the great religion (Islam) above which there is none. The king of China places himself in the second rank after the king of the Arabs. Next come the king of Rum (Byzantium) and the Ballahra (Vallabhārāja or the Cālukya king)."

The other text is the account of a conversation of Ibn Wahab with the Emperor of China. Ibn Wahab was granted an audience by the Emperor sometime between 872 and 875. The account which is of the beginning of the 10th century, runs as follows:

"The king (i.e. the Emperor of China) then asked. How do you classify the kings (of the earth). The king told the interpreter. 'Tell Ibn Wahab that we, Chinese, we count five kings. He who possesses the richest kingdom is the

king of Irak, because Irak is in the centre of the world and other kingdoms surround it. In China one calls him the *king of kings*. After him comes the king of China whom we call the *king of men* because there is no other king who can establish the basis of peace better or maintain the order better than what we do in our own country. There is no other king of whom the subjects are more loyal to the king than ours. This is the reason why the king of China is called the king of men. Then comes the *king of ferocious beasts*: this is the king of the Turks (of Toguz-Oguz) who is our neighbour. Then comes the *king of elephants* i.e. the king of India. He is also called in China the king of wisdom because wisdom is native in India. Last comes the king of Rum (Byzantium) whom we call the *king of fine men*."

These two passages clearly show that the Arab travellers also had access to the old theory of the four sovereigns and that they were making use of it to their own advantage—giving the highest place to their own ruler in the list. The Arab travellers might have picked it up in India. But a more possible source of derivation was the Buddhist lore which was carried to Baghdad between 786 and 808 A.D. by the Barmakide converts of Balkh (Sachau, *Alberuni*, p. xxxi).

But the theory whether picked up in India or not was long current in India. Prof. Pelliot has referred to a tradition current in India and recorded by both Burnouf and Lassen. The tradition says that after the fall of the Pāṇḍavas India was divided amongst four kings: Narapati, Gajapati, Chatrapati, and Aśvapati. In the *Āin-i-Ākbari* there is a description of the play of cards which are connected with twelve kings. The first three are Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati. The fourth is the *gaḍhpati* which certainly means the lord of forts (Hindi—gaḍh). The fifth is the *dhanapati* (the lord of treasures—the same as the earlier *ratnapati*). There is no mention of Chatrapati. Lastly Prof. Pelliot refers to a traditional list of kings given to Buchanan in 1807 which mentions Yudhiṣṭhira, Vikramāditya, Salivāhana, Bhoja, then three kings, and then tradition says "After this

Naraputti, Gajaputti and Ashaputti, three thrones were established." The list communicated to Buchanan seems to have been a traditional Rājavarṇśa similar to what is incorporated in the Tantras. I have recently discussed one such Rājavarṇśa (*A new source of the political history of Kāmarūpa, Ind. Hist. Quarterly*, XVIII, pp. 230 ff.) entitled Haragaūrī-saṃvāda. This list while speaking of the kings of the Kali age mentions Yudhiṣṭhira, the Nandas, the Gautamas, the Mayuras (Mauryas), the Pāṇḍavas (?), the Śakas, Vikramāditya and Bhoja. The list then says that with Bhoja the line of Kṣatriya rulers who were entitled to be Cakravartī came to an end. This may have some historical significance. King Bhoja was the founder of the Gurjara-Pratihāra Empire and had some claim to paramountcy. We shall see later on that the inscriptions of the rulers belonging to some of the petty dynasties which succeeded the Gurjara-Pratihāras mention for the first time the three types of rulers—Aśvapati, Narapati and Gajapati.

It is quite clear that the later Indian tradition has reduced the number of four sovereigns to three—Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati. Ratnapati although found in the *Āin-i-Ākbarī* under the name Dhanapati has been omitted probably because it did not correspond to anything known. But the number had been so reduced still earlier. Of all the Indian inscriptions only the later records of eleventh and twelfth centuries mention the three lords, Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati. We know that after the Mahomedan conquest of North Bengal the successors of Lakṣmaṇasena continued to rule as independent kings from Vikrampur (Dacca). Two of these rulers Keśavasena and Viśvarūpasena who were ruling towards the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries call themselves "Lord of the three kings"—Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati—*aśvapati-gajapati-narapati-rājatrayādhipati* (N. Majumdar, *Inscriptions of Bengal*, Varendra Research Society Publication, pp. 136, 145). Amongst other ruling dynasties of North India the Gahaḍavālas, the Haihayas and the Candellas use the same

titles in this period. Govindacandra, Jayacandra and Hariścandra of the Gahaḍavāla dynasty, who ruled in the 12th century, call themselves overlord of *Aśvapati-Gajapati-Narapati*. Some of the Haihaya rulers, specially Karṇa and his successor who ruled in the latter part of the 11th and in the 12th centuries call themselves—*nija-bhujopārajit-Aśvapati-Gajapati—Narapati-rāja-trayādhipati*. The Candella Trailokyamalla who ruled in the 13th century use the same title—*nija-bhujopārajit.....rāja-trayādhipati* (See H. C. Ray—*Dynastic History of Northern India*, I, pp. 519, 532, 541, etc. and II, pp. 724-725, 784, 785, etc.). They do not mean three particular rulers but only three kinds of rulers. No importance can be attached to the usual claim made by these petty rulers of the most ignominious period of Indian history to overlordship of the three kinds of rulers. It however shows that the tradition was still alive, that paramount sovereignty (cakravartin) implied mastery over the three kinds of rulers—Aśvapati, Gajapati and Narapati. The fourth in the list (Ratnapati) had been dropped. The *Sabdaḥśaṣṭakāṣṭhā* (sub. verb. *caḥṣṭha*) gives a description of different kinds of forts (*koṭṭa*) after a source entitled *Samayāmrta* and in that connection it mentions different kinds of rulers like the lords of Gaja, Aśva and Ratha, the Sāmanta, the Maṇḍaleśvara etc. (*gajāśva-ratha-bhūpālāḥ sāmantaḥ maṇḍaleśvaraḥ*). In this text also gajapati, aśvapati, rathapati are taken as different types of rulers.

It is the same old theory of the four sovereigns bereft of its geographical association. The geographical association was a new accretion in every age: with the author of the *She eu yeu king* it is India, China, Yue-che country and the Roman Orient; with Tao-suan it is China, India, Persia and T'u-kiue and with the Arabs it is either Irak, China, Rum (Byzantium) and India or Irak, China, India, (Toguz-Oguz) and Rum. But Hiuan-tsang more faithful to Indian tradition mentions only South (Gajapati), North (Aśvapati), East (Narapati) and West (Ratnapati). The tradition survived in India in a slightly modified form up to later times.

III

What was then the origin of the theory of four sovereigns? It had apparently nothing to do with four traditional divisions of the army: *hasti*, *aśva*, *ratha* and *patti* i.e. elephant, horse, chariot and infantry (Cf. *Mahāvvyutpatti*—Sakaki, p. 252). This fourfold army (*caturaṅga-balakāya*) is always associated with any king whatsoever and we do not hear of kings possessing only one of these divisions. The *Aśvapati*, *Pilupati*, and *Narapati* i.e. master of men (officer in charge of the subjects) are also mentioned in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (*ibid.*, pp. 256-257) but they are merely officers of the king. None of them represents a particular type of ruler.

We have seen that the theory of the four sovereigns is intimately connected with the conception of the Cakravartin ruler. In the golden age the Cakravartin was a ruler of the four mythical worlds of the Buddhist cosmography—(Uttara)-Kuru, (Purva)-Videha, Godāniya and Jambudvīpa. Through gradual decay of power the Cakravartin came to be the ruler of one world only, namely the Jambudvīpa. The Cakravartin ruler of Jambudvīpa was also the overlord of the four types of kings: *Aśvapati*, *Gajapati*, *Narapati* and *Ratnapati*. With the disappearance of the last Cakravartin the sovereignty of Jambudvīpa was divided amongst these four types of rulers. In later traditions *Chatrapati* replaces the *Ratnapati* but that also is soon dropped from the list; only the first three remains: *Aśvapati*, *Gajapati*, and *Narapati*. Even the vainglorious rulers of the Sena dynasty of Bengal and a few other minor dynasties of Northern India in order to establish a claim to the position of Cakravartin call themselves the overlords of the three kinds of kings.

Therefore according to the old theory a Cakravartin was the overlord of the four kinds of kings: *Aśvapati*, *Gajapati*, *Narapati* and *Ratnapati*. The ancient Buddhist texts mention amongst other requisite possessions of a Cakravartin the seven treasures (*sapta-ratnāṇi*). These seven treasures are: *Cakra*, *Hasti*, *Aśva*, *Maṇi*, *Strī*, *Gṛhapati*, and *Pari-*

nāyaka (*Mahāvvyutpatti*, p. 251). The first four help the king to establish his supremacy quickly over the whole earth up to the furthest limit of the horizon (*cakravāla*). They are of divine origin. But the next three Strī, Gṛhapati and Pariṇāyaka are of human origin. Gṛhapati is a householder. That is the meaning attached to it in the *Mahāvvyutpatti* (Tib. khyim bdag). Pariṇāyaka means a minister (Tib. blon po). But in the Pāli texts (*Mahāsudassana-sutta*, *Dīgha Nikāya—Dialogues of Buddha*, vol. II) Gahapati is interpreted as a treasurer and Pariṇāyaka as an adviser. Whatever may be their real significance, the last three treasures of the sapta-ratna viz., Strī, Gṛhapati and Pariṇāyaka are of human origin and the master of these three may be simply styled a Narapati. But it is not still clear if this conception of seven treasures essential for a king to rise to the position of a Cakravartin had anything to do with the old theory of the four sovereigns. All the elements of the theory are there: the best of horses (Aśva-ratna), the best of elephants (Hasti-ratna), the best of gems (Maṇi-ratna) and the best of human beings associated with him in three essential capacities as wife, treasurer and minister (strī, gṛhapati, and pariṇāyaka). Aśvapati, Gajapati etc. may also be interpreted in these senses i.e. not as the Lord of Horse, Lord of Elephant etc. but as the king of horses, the king of elephants, etc.

However in the oldest source, the *She eul yeu king* in which this theory of four sovereigns is found for the first time, the theory is formulated in a different way. The four Lords: Aśvapati etc. are so many sovereign rulers connected with the four quarters: North, South, West and East. This seems to be an elaboration of another aspect of the Cakravartin. A Cakravartin is one who is "the Lord of the Four Quarters" (*Dīgha Nikāya*, loc. cit.). His sovereignty extends in every direction up to the very end of the Cakravāla. But with the disappearance of a Cakravartin the rulers of the four quarters become independent. An Indian author of the Kushan period would naturally be tempted to elaborate this theory further in the light of the geographical

knowledge possessed by him. The kings of the four quarters according to the old theory were connected with the essential requisites of the Cakravartin, *aśva*, *gaja*, *maṇi* and *nara*. In the north and the north-west the Yue-che and other Central Asian nomads were famous in India as horse-breeders. The Kamboja horse imported from the north-west was known to be the best. The sea-route connecting Western India with the Græco-Roman world was being frequently used by the Greek sailors and the wealth of the Roman Empire (Ta-ts'in) was soon becoming proverbial. Southern India was famous for its elephants. The Chinese Empire in the East with its vast agglomeration of human races was known for its general prosperity. The compiler of the *She eul yeu king* must have belonged to Kashmir or at any rate to North-Western India.

A similar information which a Chinese traveller named K'ang-t'ai picked up in Further India (Fu-nan) from Indian sources in the middle of the third century A.D. (Pelliot, *BEFEO.*, III, 275-276)—"It is said in the foreign countries that there are three abundances under the sky: the abundance of men in China, the abundance of gems in Ta-ts'in, the abundance of horses in the Yue-che country." He had not either heard anything about the abundance of elephants in Southern India or attached any special importance to it as elephants were equally abundant in Further India. Hence it is the question of this abundance which guided the unknown compiler of the *She eul yeu king* while he was altering the old theory in the light of things known to him. The idea of two abundances at least continued to be proverbial in India for a long time. Išānavarman, the Maukharī king of the 6th century while carrying on military campaign in different directions speaks of having defeated the Andhras "who had thousands of three-fold rutting elephants" and the Śūlikas who had "a cavalry of countless galloping horses" (Basak—*History of North-Eastern India*, p. 111). The Śūlikas whom I have shown to be the Sogdian immigrants to India must

have belonged to the mass of Central Asian nomads settled in the North-West of India. (*Śūlika, Culika and Culikā-Paiśāci—Journal of Letters*, vol. xxi).

It may not be out of place to point out that the association of Aśvapati with the North-West of India is very old. The name Aśvapati is associated in the Epics with two countries in the North-West, Kekaya and Madra. An Aśvapati of Kaikeya is mentioned in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* and the *Chāndogya Upaniṣad*. He was contemporaneous with king Janaka of Mithilā. The same name Aśvapati, is borne by the maternal uncle of Bharata (*Rāmāyaṇa* II, 9. 22 etc.; H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 2nd ed., p. 36). In the *Mahābhārata* the name is associated with the Madra country. Dr. Raychaudhuri has shown on the evidence available in the epics that the two countries were contiguous,—Kekaya was between Gandhāra and the Beas and Madra, between the Beas and the Irāvati. The city of Śākala belonged to the latter country. It is stated in the *Mahābhārata* (Vana, 292) that king Aśvapati of Madra was the father of Sāvitrī. It is not likely that in all these cases Aśvapati has been used as a proper name. King Śalya of Madra fought on the side of the Kurus in the Mahābhārata war. When Karṇa assumed the control of the Kuru army he was selected as his charioteer on account of his special knowledge of horses. His knowledge of horses it is said, was greater than that of Mātali, the charioteer of Indra. He knew the nature of horses (aśvahṛdaya) well and was an expert in the treatment of the horses (*Mahābhārata*, Karṇa, 32, verses 60-61; 35, verses 4ff.). Nakula, the fourth Pāṇḍava, who was a direct nephew of Śalya also knew the same art and by virtue of it assumed the control of king Virāṭ's stable during one year of their *incognito* life (Virāṭ, II, verse, 2); King Śalya is described in the *Ādiparva* (107, verse 3) as *Bālhiḱa-puṅgava*, the best man amongst the Bālhiḱas. The northern Punjab to which Madra country belonged is also called Bāhika, probably a corrupt form of the same name Bālhiḱa, in the

Mahābhārata (Karna, 44) and the tribes living in that part of the country are decried for their bad manners. The Central Asian nomads had already come up to the Punjab before the *Mahābhārata* had passed through the final stage of its development.

Lastly two inscriptional evidences of a later period probably bear out the same association of Aśvapati with the Madra country in the Punjab. The first is the Udayagiri Inscription of the Gupta Era 108 (426 A.D.) of the time of Kumāragupta (Fleet, *Corpus*, p. 258). It records the pious gift of a Jaina teacher named Ācārya Gośarman. He was the son of the Aśvapati, a soldier named Saṅghila, who was born "in the region of the north, the best of countries which resembles the land of Northern Kurus (in beatitude)." The Northern Kuru country was compared only with the Northern Madra country in ancient times. It therefore seems that there is an allusion to the Madra country and its rulers who bore the title of Aśvapati. In the Haraha Inscription of the sixth century the Maukharī kings also claim descent from Aśvapati of the solar race. This, according to certain scholars, suggests early relation of the Maukharis with the Madras of the Punjab (Sen—*Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal*, p. 241).

She Eul Yeu King

"Sūtra spoken by Buddha on the twelve [years'] wanderings" translated by Sha-men Kālodaka of the Western country (Si-yu)—under the Eastern Tsin dynasty; Taisho ed. no. 195.

[I.]

In the A-seng-k'i (asaṃkheya) kalpa the Bodhisattva was the king of a country. His father and mother died early. He gave the kingdom to his younger brother. After giving up the kingdom he travelled seeking to learn the law. (While thus travelling) he saw from a distance a Brahmin of the K'iu-tan (Gautama) family. He then followed the Brahmin to learn the law (from him). The Brahmin told the Bodhisattva: "Think of the royal dress on your body. You will have to put on a dress made of matted hairs like that of mine which I got from the Gautama family." The Bodhisattva then got a garment like that to cover his body and thus became one of the Gautama family.

Then after purifying himself he entered the deep mountainous forest and sat on the peak of a hill absorbed in the meditation of the law. The Brahmin then said: "You were a king. You were respected and you lived in happiness. Now you will have to submit to pains."

So in the summer he had to drink water and eat only fruits and melons. In the winter he returned to the city and at the cross roads begged for his food. Then he came back underneath the tree to practise meditation with an undisturbed mind. Once while the Bodhisattva came back to his country to beg for food the king of the country down to his people could not recognise him. He had become a small Gautama. The Bodhisattva stayed in the mangoe (kan-ko) garden outside the city. A viḥāra (king-she) was erected there. Inside it there was only one seat.

There were then five hundred notorious thieves in that country. They had stolen the things of the royal officers

and were running away. They were passing by the vihāra of the Bodhisattva. They then left their foot marks there and also abandoned the (stolen) things on either side of the vihāra.

The next day the people came out in search of the thieves and by following their foot marks came up to the vihāra of the Bodhisattva. They arrested the Bodhisattva and questioned him for information on the notorious thieves. They had committed theft many times. The punishment was more than death. The king ordered the ministers to give him an exemplary punishment. As the law in regard to such men was to put them on the stake so the Bodhisattva also was put on the stake. His body was bleeding and the blood was flowing down to the ground.

Mahā-Gautama saw it with his heavenly eyes from his place in the depth of the mountain. Then by using his magical power (*rddhipada*) he came down flying through the sky and asked the Bodhisattva: "What sin have you committed, my child, so that you are suffering such torture? There is no boil (on your body) but you are still bearing the pain of the poison in this way." The Bodhisattva replied: "The pain is external but the mind within is full of mercy. I do not know what sin I have committed to be exposed suddenly to such torture." Mahā-Gautama said: "You have neither any son nor any disciple (lit. family). Who will be your descendant? Who is to bear such kind of pain patiently? The Bodhisattva answered: "Life is momentary. Why do you speak of sons and grandsons?"

At that time the king ordered his men on the left and the right to get a stone bow and arrow. On getting it the king shot at the Bodhisattva and killed him. Mahā-Gautama was much aggrieved and wept. He then took down the dead body and buried it. He collected blood from the mud both from the right side and the left and made them into balls. He then returned to his monastery in the mountain, put the blood taken from the left side in a vessel on the left side and that taken from the right side in a vessel

on the right. Then Mahā-Gautama said: "If it is true that you were a great master of the law (tao-she) then the gods of the heavens should make a man of the blood." After ten months the blood on the left side became a man and that on the right side a woman. The first was called Shō yi jen.

[II.]

At the beginning of the Bhadrakalpa the Precious Tathāgata She-kia (Sākya) lived 5000000 years. The next twenty five kings each lived 3000000 years. Then the king Wen-t'o-kie (文陀竭) lived 1000000 years. Then the Kṣatriya Che-kia-yue (Cakravartī) kings and the kings of the left flank and those of the right flank all lived 100000 years each. Since the time of the king called Kuan-hi (Harṣa) all kings lived 84000 years each. Guided by a bad thought the Cakravartī (Che-kia-yue) king sacrificed an ox and for causing this harm to life lost his Golden Wheel, got the Silver Wheel and the mastery over the three heavens only. He lived only 10000 years. The king Firm-Thought (Dṛḍha-citta) used armour and lived 5000 years only. He got the Copper Wheel, ruled over two heavens and was the lord of the West and the South only. After that the king Easy-killing (Sukhaghna) lived 2500 years, got the Iron Wheel and was the ruler of the Southern heaven only. The last king had five princes who by causing harm to living beings shortened their life to 1000 years. In old times there were only nine kinds of pains from disease, cold, heat, thirst, hunger, birth, old age, sickness and death. Since the Brahmins began to sacrifice living beings 404 kinds of diseases originated.

From the time of king Simhacitta man's life was reduced to 120 years. After king Simhacitta there were 84 kings beginning with Simhamati, all having short lives. In their times human life was gradually reduced to 80, 70, 50, 30, 20 and 10 years.

Afterwards there was a king called Simhajiva-ratha who was also called Suddhodana (lit. Suddha). He was the father of the Bodhisattva. From the beginning up to the end of the Bodhisattva's life it is 84000 years. The king Che-kia-yue (Cakravarti) was of the Gautama race. It was a pure and perfect race.

The Bodhisattva was in the T'eu-shu (Tuṣita) heaven. When he wished to descend on the earth he looked around to find out the country where he could take his birth. He said: "It is the family of king Suddhodana where I can incarnate myself." There was then in the heaven a tree called T'eu-tan (Devadāru). The Bodhisattva however sat under a different tree and was absorbed in thought. The first tree then emitted a light which knew no change. At that time a heavenly being asked: "Why did the Bodhisattva give up the first tree and come to sit under the other tree?" A devaputra understood the mind of the Bodhisattva. He replied: "Do you not know? The Bodhisattva now wishes to go down to the Yen-feu-li (Jambudvīpa) and is looking around to see in which kingdom he would take birth. He will be born in the family of Suddhodana."

All the Gods then said: "The Bodhisattva is now going down to take birth on the earth. What shall we offer him?" They then thought over it and said: "In the bright heaven there are 404 and sundry other gems, each of them having a (separate) name. There are also precious flowers. A chariot can be made for him with them." The White Elephant named Yi-lo-man (Airāvata), the Nāga king, will draw it. His hairs are whiter than the snowy mountains. He has 33 heads. Each head has 7 trunks, each of which contains a lake. In each lake there are 7 Yu-po (utpala) flowers. Upon each flower there is a beautiful girl."

The Bodhisattva came down riding on the precious chariot along with 84000 devaputras. The car was drawn by the White Elephant. At that time the queen of king Suddhodana had the dream of a white elephant. She was taken by fright and spoke about it to the king.

[III.]

The father of the Bodhisattva was called Śuddhodana. His father (and three uncles) were four brothers. King Śuddhodana had two sons.—the elder was Si-ta (Siddhārtha), the younger Nan-t'o (Nanda). The name of the Bodhisattva's mother was Mo-ye (Māyā). The name of Nanda's mother was Kiu-tan-mi (Gautamī). The eldest uncle of the Bodhisattva was Amṛtodana. The latter had two sons—the elder was named T'en-ta (Devadatta) and the younger A-nan (Ānanda). The second (middle) uncle of the Bodhisattva was called king Śuklodana. He had two sons—the elder was called She Mo-na (Śākya Mahānāman) and the younger A-na-liu (Aniruddha). The name of the youngest uncle of the Bodhisattva was king Śukrodana. He had two sons, the elder was called She-kia wang (Śākyarāja?) and the younger She sha wang (?).

In the kingdom of Kia-wei-lo-yue (Kapilavastu) there were 8 cities and 900,000 houses. Devadatta was born on the 7th day of the 4th month. Buddha was born on the 8th day of the 4th month, Buddha's younger brother Nanda on the 9th day of the 4th month and Ānanda on the 10th day of the 4th month. The height of Devadatta's body was 15 ft. 4 inches that of Buddha's body 16 ft., that of Nanda's body 15 ft. 4 inches, that of Ānanda's body 15 ft. 3 inches and that of the body of persons belonging to the Sho-yi family 14 ft. The height of the body of other people in the country was 13 ft.

The relatives of the Bodhisattva lived 800 li outside the city. The Gautama clan was a small ruling clan ruling over 1000000 houses. They were also called kings of 100000 (lakṣapati). The family of the Bodhisattva's wife was also called Gautama. The chief of the Sho-yi family was Shuei-kuang (Jalaprabha). His wife's mother was named Yue-niu (Candrakumārī). She belonged to a city near the frontier. The time when the girl was born the sun had nearly set. But inside the house everything was bright. So the girl was given the name Kiu-yi (Gopī) which means

"Bright Girl" (Ming-niu). Gopī was the first wife of the Prince. Her father was the Elder Jalaprabha. The second wife of the Prince gave birth to Lo-yu (Rāhula). She was called Ye-wei-t'an (Yaśodharā). Her father was the Elder Ye-she (Yaśa). His third wife was Lu-yi (Mṛgajā). Her father was the Elder She (Śākya). So the Prince had three wives. His royal father had got built for him three palaces suitable for three seasons. There were 20000 dancing girls in each of the palaces. In the three palaces there were in all 60000 dancing girls. The Prince was to be a Che-kia-yue (Cakravartī) king and hence 60000 dancing girls were placed in his palace.

[IV.]

Buddha left the house in his 29th year. He attained the Bodhi (tao) in his 35th year. From the 8th day of the 4th month till the 15th day of the 7th month he remained seated under the tree. This was the first year.

In the second year he preached the law to A-jo-kiu (Ajñāta Kaundinya) and his other friends in the Deer Park. He then explained the law to Pi-p'o-tan and others. He then preached the law to 17 men, Kia-che-lo and others. He also explained the law to the Elder Ta-tsai (Mahābala?), Eul-tsai-nien (Dvi-bala-citta?), Yiu-po-yi (Upaka) and Cheng-nien (Samyak-smṛti), the Ni-kien (Nirgrantha). Later on he spoke the law to 42 men including Ti-ho-kie-lo-fo (Dipaṅkara-Buddha).

In the third year he preached the law to three disciples of Kia-ye (Kāśyapa) and to a community of 1000 Bhikṣus,

In the fourth year he preached the law to the Nāgas, Pretas and demi-gods on the Siang-t'eu (Gajasingha) mountain.

In the fifth year he preached the law to Sse-ho-mei in the Bamboo grove. In the fifth year while he was on his way to Sho-wei (Śrāvastī) the Brahmin She-li-fo (Śāriputra) was waiting under a tree with 125 disciples. At that time Mu-lien (Maudgalyāyana) who was a general in the country of

Mi-yi-lo (Mithilā ?) while passing by that way saw Śāriputra waiting under the tree. He asked Śāriputra why he was waiting there. Śāriputra replied: "I wish to learn the law (tao)." Maudgalyāyana replied: "I shall be also your companion." So saying he sent away 100 soldiers. Only 125 remained with him. Thus the two had with them altogether 250 men.

While Śāriputra was entering the city for fen-wei (piṇḍa-pāta) he met with a disciple of Buddha, the Bhikṣu Ma-she (Aśvajit). Śāriputra enquired from him who was his religious teacher, as his dress was not the same (as his). The Bhikṣu Aśvajit replied: "I am the disciple of Buddha." Śāriputra asked: "What law does Buddha speak?" Aśvajit replied: "According to Buddha all dharma has a cause. (He also speaks on) its destruction, on the extinction of all pains and on nirvāṇa." When Śāriputra received from him the law of Siu-t'o-yuan (Śrotāpanna) he felt very happy, came back to Maudgalyāyana and said: "There is a godly man in the world." Maudgalyāyana asked: "Who has spoken the law to you?" Śāriputra then gave him the whole account. Maudgalyāyana then wanted to get the law of Śrotāpanna. The two men then went to Buddha with the disciple of Buddha.

Before they had come up to Buddha, Buddha came to know about it and told the Bhikṣus: "Two learned men are coming to-day, one is the Bhikṣu Che hui (Prajñāmati) and the other Shen-tsiu (Rddhipada)." When they arrived Buddha spoke to them on the four *truths (ārya-satyāni). Śāriputra became an Arhat in 7 days while Maudgalyāyana became an Arhat in 15 days.

In the sixth year Siu-ta and Prince Che-t'o (Jeta) built for Buddha a Vihāra, 12 pagodas (Fo t'u sse), 72 halls, 3600 rooms and 500 towers.

In the 7th year in the country of Kiu-ye-ni (?) Buddha met with eight men, the Bodhisattva So-t'o-ho and others and communicated to them the *Pan cheu king*.

In the eighth year while staying on the mountain Liu he

made a disciple of the king Chen-t'o-lo (Candra) and spoke the law.

In the ninth year he spoke the law to T'o-kiu-mo inside the lake Wei.

In the tenth year he returned to the country of Mo-kie (Magadha) and spoke the law to king Fo-kia-sha.

In the tenth year under the fearful (Bhayaṃkara) tree he spoke on the past life to Mi-lei (Maitreya).

In the twelfth year while returning to his father's country he met the members of the Śākya family at a distance of 80 li from the city and spoke the law to Ch'a-mo-kie. On returning to his country he spoke the law to his father and members of the Śākya family and thus saved 84000 men. They got the law of Siu-t'o-yuan (Śrotāpanna).

The fourteen countries in which Buddha travelled for twelve years, converted people and spoke the law were the following :

The king Po-sse-jo.....in Chinese *ho yue*

Kia-wei-lo-yue in Chinese *miao to*

Sho-wei country in Chinese *wu wu pu yu*

Wei-ye-li country in Chinese *kuang ta*

another name is *tu sheng sse* (saving from birth and death)

Lo-yue-ki.....in Chinese the city of *wang she*.

Kiu-leu country.....in Chinese *che she* country.

Po-lo-nai country in Chinese *lu ye* -(Deer-Park)

—these are otherwise known as "All

Buddha countries."

[V.]

In the Yen-feu-t'i (Jambudvīpa) there are sixteen large kingdoms and 84000 cities. There are eight kings and four devaputras. In the East there is the Devaputra of the Tsin (China). The people are prosperous there. In the South there is the Devaputra of the country of T'ien-chu (India). The land is much noted for its elephants. In the West there is the Devaputra of Ta-ts'in country (Roman

Orient). That country produces gold, silver, gems and jade. In the North-West there is the Devaputra of the Yue-che. Their country produces many good horses.

There are 84000 cities in the centre (of the Jambudvīpa), 6400 races of men; the trees are of 10000 varieties and grasses of 8000 kinds. Varieties of herbs are 740. The scents are of 43 kinds, gems of 121 kinds, and real gems of 7 kinds.

In the ocean there are 2500 kingdoms. In 180 kingdoms the people live on 5 cereals. In 330 kingdoms they eat fish, sweet tortoise, tortoise of the land and crocodile. There are five kings, each king governing 500 cities. The first king is that of Sse-li. All the people of that country worship Buddha. They do not worship any other god. The name of the second king is Kia-lo. His country produces seven jewels. The name of the third king is Pu-lo. His country produces 42 kinds of incense and white leu-li (vaidurya). The name of the fourth king is Sho-ye. His country produces pi-pa (pippala, and pepper). The name of the fifth king is Na-ngo. His country produces pearl and seven coloured leu-li (vaidurya). The people of these five great countries are black and short-statured. The distance between them is 65000 li. From these countries up to the end (of the Jambudvīpa) there lies the ocean and no people live there. From there up to the Iron Hills it is 140000 li.

* * * * *

[The kingdom of Kiu-yi-na-kie (Kūśinagara) is 1000 li to the south-east of the kingdom of Kia-wei-lo (Kapilavastu). The kingdom of Wang sho (Rājagṛha) is 2200 li to the south-east of the kingdom of Kia-wei-lo-wei (Kapilavastu). The place where the Buddha discovered the path (Gayā) is 200 li to the south-east of the city of Wang sho (Rājagṛha). The kingdom of Wei-ye-li (Vaiśālī) is 1800 li to the east of Kia-(wei)-lo-wei (Kapilavastu). The garden of Āmrāpali is 3 li to the south of the town of Wei-ye-li (Vaiśālī), to the west of the high road. The kingdom of Ye-po (Campā?) is 1280 li to the east of the kingdom of

Kia-wei-lo-wei (Kapilavastu). The kingdom of Nan (Punḍra-vardhana) is 3200 li to the east of the kingdom of Kapilavastu. The kingdom of Sho-wei (Śrāvastī) is 500 li to the west of the kingdom of Kapilavastu. The kingdom of Po-lo-nai (Vārāṇasī) is 960 li to the west of the kingdom of Kapilavastu. The place where Buddha turned the wheel of the law (Deer Park) is 20 li to the south of the kingdom of Vārāṇasī. The kingdom of Po-lo-nai-sse (Vārāṇasī) is 1400 li to the south of the kingdom of Sho-wei (Śrāvastī). The river Heng (Gaṅgā) flows south-east through that country. The mount Ki-sho-kiu (Gṛdhra-kūṭa) has five peaks. The place where Buddha recited the sacred texts is the central peak of the hill.]

Note: The last paragraph placed within square brackets is found in the quotation in the *King liu yi siang* to which we have already referred. The preceding paragraph is found in the *She eu yeu king* as well as in the said quotation of the *King liu yi siang*. There is some difference between the two texts in regard to this paragraph: instead of 330 the *King liu* has 2320, instead of "42 kinds of incense" the *King liu* gives "43 kinds" and for Na-ngo the *King liu* gives Na-p'o.

The five geographical names Sse-li, Kia-lo, Sho-ye and Na-ngo (var. Na-p'o) have been commented on by Prof. Lévi (*Pour l'histoire du Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 83). He refers to the *Fan fan yu*, a Chinese compilation of the 6th century, in which these names have been explained after a Sūtra which is now lost. According to it Kia-lo means black (Kāla), Pu-lo, "city" (Pura) and Sho-ye, "victory" (Jaya). Of these Prof. Lévi has suggested a definite identification only for one—Sho-ye. He would identify it with Java. But the translation of the name as "victory" (Jaya) suggests a connection of the name not with Java but with Śrīvijaya. In fact M. Ferrand has proposed this identification (*L'Empire Sumatranais de Srivijaya*, tirage, p. 154). The only difficulty in accepting it lies in the fact that there is no other record to

prove the existence of the name as early as the 3rd century A.D. when the *She eul yeu king* was translated for the first time. Whatever may be the definite identification it is quite clear that Sho-ye must be located in the Java-Sumatra group. Amongst the other names Sse-li *Sie-lji is certainly an old transcription of a name like *Siha-dip* (Sinhala-dvīpa). This value of *li* is also found in Yen-feu-li (Jambudvīpa). The explanation of the two names Kia-lo and Pu-lo in the *Fan fan yu* as "black" (Kāla) and "city" (pura) seems to be fanciful. Kia-lo, on the contrary, reminds us of later Kia-lo-hi (Grahi). Pu-lo restored as Pura would be meaningless as the name of an island. It may be the Indonesian word *Pulo-Pulau* which means 'island' and is used with names of different islands (cf. Pulo Condore, Pulo Penang etc.). Na-ngo seems to be the correct name and not Na-p'o. It may be restored as Nagna—the island of the naked people. Such a name is given by Yi-tsing to the Nicobar Isles (*Records*, p. 68).

THE CHINESE INDEX

In the following index I have given the transcription of the important names. I have also stated the old pronunciation of the characters according to the *Analytical Dictionary* of Karlgren. This Dictionary as is well known gives the pronunciation of about the 6th century A.D. Through it we can get an idea of the pronunciation of a still earlier periods. The transcriptions contained in the *She eul yeu king* belong to the 4th century A.D..

In the index some of the common characters which occur too often such as t'o 陀, lo 羅, kie 竭 and mo 摩 have been indicated by the numbers [1] [2] [3] and [4] respectively.

A-jo-kiu 阿若拘 *â-nziak-kiu = Ājñāna-Kaundinya

A-na-liu—那律 *â-nâ-liuŏt = Aniruddha

A-nan—難 *â-nân = Ananda

Ch'a-mo-kie 差 [4] [3] *tš'a-muâ-g'iat = Sumāgadhā(?)

Che-kia-yue 遮迦越 *t'sia-ka-ji*et = Cakravartī

- Che-t'o 祇 [1] *t'sie-dâ = Jeta
 Chen-t'o-lo 眞 [1] [2] *t'sien-d'â-lâ = Candra
 Fo-kia-sha 弗迦沙 *piuət-ka-ša = Pukkusa
 Kia-cha-lo 者 [2] *ka-t'sia-lâ
 Kia-lo [2] *ka-lâ = Kāla (?Grāhi)
 Kia-wei-lo-yue 惟 [2] 閱 *ka-wi-lâ-i'ät = Kapilavastu
 Kia-ye 葉 *ka-iäp = Kāśyapa
 Kiu-t'an-mi 曇彌 *kiu-d'an-mjie = Gautamī
 Kiu-yi 夷 *kiu-i = Gopī
 Kiu-ye-ni 拘耶尼 *Kiu-(z)ia-nji = Kuśinagara
 Kiu-lin 鳩留 *kiəu-liəu = Kuru
 Liu 柳 *lieu?
 Lo-yue-k'i [2] 閱祇 *lâ-i'at-g'jie = *Rāyagiha < Rājagṛha
 Lo-yu [2] 云 *lâ-giuən < Lāghula? < Rāhula
 Mi yi-lo 彌夷 [2] *mjie-i-lâ = Mithilā?
 Mi-lei 勒 *mjie-lək = Maitrak? = Maitreya
 Mo-kie [4] [3] *muā-giät = Magadha
 Mu-lien 目連 *miuk-liän = Mogallāna < Maudgalyāyana
 Na-ngo 那額 *nâ-ngək = Nagna
 Nan-t'o 難 [1] *nân-dâ = Nanda
 Pi-p'o-tan 畢婆耽 piət-b'uä-tām?
 Po-sse-jo 波斯匿 *puâ-sie-niek = Pasanna = Pasenādi
 Pu-lo 不 [2] *piəu-lâ = Pulo?
 Si-ta 悉達 *siet-d'ät = Siddhattha = Siddhārtha
 Siu-t'a 須 *siu-d'ät = Sudatta
 Siu-t'o-yuan 亘 *siu-d'â-yuân = Sotapanna = Srota-panna
 So-t'o-ho 娑 [1] 和 *sâ-d'â-yuā?
 Ssse-li 斯利 *sie-lji = Sihadīa = Simha-dvīpa
 Sse-ho-mei 私呵味 *si-ä-mj'ei?
 She-mo-na 釋 [4] 納 *šiak-muā nuāi = Sākyamuni
 Sho-yi 舍夷 *šia-i = Śāgya < Śākya
 Sho-wei 衛 *sia'-ji'ai = Sāvai = Sāvatti < Srāvasti
 Sho-ye 閼耶 *sia-ia = Jaya
 T'eu-ta 調達 d'ieu-d'ät = Devadatta
 T'eu-shu 兜術 *tek-d'z'iuət = Tuṣita
 Ti-ho-kie-lo 提和 [3] [2] *die-yuā-g'iat-lâ = Dipamkara

To-kiu-mo [2] 幅 [4] *d'e-k'iuət-muâ?

Wei-ye-li 維耶離 *wei-(z)ia-ljie = Vaisāli(?)

Wei 威 i^wei(-d), mistake for an-i^wei(-d)? = anotatta

Wen-t'o-kie 文 [1] [3] * .miuən-d'â-g'ïät

Yen-feu-li 閼浮利 *iäm-p'iu-lji, (- - die) =

Jambudvīpa

Yi-lo-man, 伊 [2] 慢 i-lâ-man = Airāvaṇa

Ye-wei-t'an 耶惟檀 ia-wi-d'ân = Yaśodharā

Ye-she 移施 *ie- ,sie = Yaśa

Yiu-po-yi 憂波夷 *ieu-puâ-,i = Upaga < Upaka?

The Rise of Sukhodaya

BY DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR

The origin of the Thai Kingdom of Sukhodaya is involved in obscurity. Some light is thrown on this by an inscription found at Sukhodaya. The relevant passage is, however, very mutilated, and does not make any complete sense. Coëdès, who first brought out its historical importance, has drawn some conclusions which are now generally accepted. It appears that a Kambuja general was sent against two Thai chiefs named Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thao and Phō Khun Phā Muang, chief of Muang Rāt. The former had taken possession of Sajjanālaya and the latter with his army came to his aid. The Kambuja army which occupied Sukhodaya, or at least barred access to it, was defeated and the victorious Thai Chief Phō Khun Phā Muang then entered Sukhodaya and entrusted its government to Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thao. The latter, however, we are told, could not enter the city out of respect (or fear, it is not clear which) for his ally. So the former removed his army, and when Bāng Klāng Thao entered Sukhodaya, formally consecrated him to the throne of Sukhodaya under the name of Śrī Indrapatīndrāditya with the title Kamraten Añ Phā Muang, which had been conferred on him by the king of Kambuja. The passage of the inscription which relates this, although somewhat cryptic, seems to convey that Phō Khun Phā Muang, who had married the daughter of the king of Kambuja, was a vassal chief and had received from him formal investiture as such. By his defeat of the "audacious Khom" i.e., the Kambuja general sent to oppose him, and triumphal entry into Sukhodaya, Phā Muang regarded himself as the suzerain, and conferred, in his turn, on his ally, the position and titles he had himself received from the suzerain king of Kambuja. Thus we may trace in this incident the virtual liberation of N. Siam from the yoke of Kambuja. But the old linkswere not altogether broken, for the old Kambuja titles were borne by the new king and his successors.

Interest naturally centres around Phō Khun Phā Muang who was thus instrumental in liberating Siam from Kambuja suzerainty. Cœdès, who brought out the above facts, has not, unfortunately, pursued this question any further, but there are certain points of great interest which merit a fuller discussion. According to the inscription, Phā Muang had married the daughter of the king of Kambuja, and obtained the sacred sword, the honorific title named Śrī Indrapatīndrāditya and a formal investiture from him. All these point to his identity with king Śrīndravarman of Kambuja, who had married the daughter of king Jayavarman VIII of Kambuja. Now Cheu Ta-Kuan, who accompanied the Chinese embassy to the court of Śrīndravarman in 1296 A.D. gives us the following account of this king "The new king is the son-in-law of the old. He had adopted a military career. His father-in-law loved his daughter who stole the golden sword (of the king) and took it to her husband. The son, thus deprived of succession, plotted to raise an army. The new king came to know of it, cut off the fingers of his feet and shut him up in a dark chamber."³ The

2 The text of the Ins. may be literally translated as follows: "Formerly the divine king of Śrī Sodharapura had given to Phō Khun Phā Muang his daughter named Nang Sikharamahādevī, the sacred sword Jayaśrī and an honorific title like his own. Phō Khun Bāng Klāng Thao received the name Śrī Indrapatīndrāditya because Phō Khun Phā Muang took his own name for giving it, in his turn, to his friend." Cœdès has pointed out that in modern Siamese and Cambodian documents Śrī Sodharapura appears as an element in the literary designation of the capital of Cambodia (*BEFEO.*, XIII. VI. p. 9; XVIII, 9, p. 24). Cœdès formerly restored the name as Siridhara or Siri Sundara (*Ibid.*). But he now (*Id.*, 1920, p. 241) proposes to take it as a corruption of Yaśodharapura, the name of the old Kambuja capital, because he finds in a modern Cambodian state paper the name of the capital written as "Kambujādhipati Śrī Yaśodharā brah Mahā-nagara Indraprastha Raṣtha rājadhānī."

3 *BEFEO.*, Vol. II, p. 176.

account of Cheu Ta-Kuan is partly corroborated by a Kambuja inscription which says that Jayavarman VIII abdicated the throne in favour of his son-in-law.⁴ According to the custom followed in Kambuja the prince who was consecrated as heir-apparent with the title Śrī Indrapati or Indrāditya would be called Śrīndravarman on accession to the throne.^{4a} Thus we have a remarkable coincidence, both in name and the three special circumstances (marriage of the king's daughter and the possession of the sword, indicating investiture as heir-apparent) between the Kambuja king Śrīndravarman and the chief Phā Muang. Besides, the fact that this chief, although son-in-law of the Kambuja king, was opposed by an "audacious Kambuja general" would be explained by the rivalry between Śrīndravarman of Kambuja and his brother-in-law referred to by Cheu Ta-Kuan. Such coincidences cannot be dismissed as casual and we are justified in presuming the identity of the two. In that case we must hold that prince Śrīndravarman was invested as regent or Viceroy over Siam during the reign of his father-in-law, and in the struggle for succession with his brother-in-law, which took place during the reign of the old king, he had the assistance of the Thai chief whose services he rewarded by his appointment as vassal chief of Sukhodaya, nominally under his suzerainty. It was probably not long before the chief of Sukhodaya became too powerful and challenged the authority of Kambuja, and the 'recent wars with the Siamese which devastated the Angkor region' as reported by Cheu Ta-Kuan might refer to the civil war or to the later stages of this war for liberation. In any case we are justified in presuming that the rise of Sukhodaya as an independent kingdom was probably due to the civil war between Śrīndravarman, the son-in-law of the king of Kambuja, and his brother-in-law.

4 Mangalārtha Temple Ins., V. XLI, *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 393 ff.

4a *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXVIII, p. 100.

If this presumption be accepted we have to refer the accession of Indrāditya to the reign of Jayavarman VIII who ascended the throne in 1243 A.D. or somewhat later. This is in conflict with the current view that Indrāditya founded the kingdom of Sukhodaya in 1218 A.D. This view, however, rests upon a highly speculative interpretation of a passage in the Nagara Jum Ins. by P. Petithuguenin.⁵ He translates ll. 19-21 of the Ins. as follows: "The year in which Phrayā Mahā Dharmarāja constructed (or commenced) the Phra Dhātu, the age of men was lowered below 100 years. That was 139 years ago, and the year of the reduction is really the year of Hare." He then observes: "If this phrase has any sense it appears to convey that 139 years before 1279 i.e., in 1140 Śaka (=1218), which was really a year of Hare,⁶ under a king named Phrayā Mahā Dharmarāja an important social revolution took place, which could well be, as already remarked by Lajonquiere, the date of accession of the first king of Sukhodaya. It is not then Śrī Sūrya Phrah Mahā Dharmarājādhirāja who reigned from 1276 to 1298 Śaka, but one of his predecessors more than a century ago, who is the Phrah or Bā Thammarat of the tradition and who could not be any other than Indrāditya."

It is needless to point out that the above theory about the accession of Indrāditya in 1218 A.D. rests on a very weak basis and cannot be taken seriously. The earliest definite date in the chronology of Sukhodaya is furnished by the Inscription of Rama Khamheng,⁷ according to which this king, who was the third son of Indrāditya, and the third king of the dynasty, was on the throne between 1283 and 1292 A.D. This would place the accession of Indrāditya some time about the middle of the third century A.D. Now the Pali chronicle *Jināḷālamālini* places the accession of Phra Ruang the founder of the dynasty

5 BEFEO., Vol. XVI, No. 3, p. 18.

6 This is not correct. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 25.

7 JS., Vol. VI, Part I.

in 1256 A.D. Prince Damrong has suggested the identification of Phra Ruang and Indrāditya and Coedès also favours the same view.⁸ We may, therefore, provisionally, accept 1256 A.D. as the date of accession of Indrāditya, though we shall not be justified in regarding it as an established fact.

If we accept this date for Indrāditya, and identify the chief Phā Muang with the future king of Kambuja named Indravarman we have to reconstruct the political history of the period somewhat differently than is done at present. It would appear that either the struggle referred to in the Sukhodaya Inscription must have taken place long after the accession of Indrāditya or that the civil war in Kambuja between the son and son-in-law of Jayavarman VIII must have commenced at an early part of the reign of that king. Both these views being opposed to the current ideas on the subject, they may be examined a little more closely.

It is generally assumed that Indrāditya began his political career as chief of Sukhodaya. This, however, is not borne out by any positive evidence. On the other hand the Sukhodaya Inscription referred to above shows that he was already the chief of the principality of Sajjanālaya when he joined Phā Muang. Instances are not wanting when a petty chief, who later becomes ruler of an important kingdom, dates his accession from his first coming to power. We may thus regard 1256 A.D. (or any other date that may be accepted on more positive evidence) as the date when Indrāditya first became a ruling chief and not necessarily that of his conquest of Sukhodaya.

The perusal of the first part of Rama Khamheng's Inscription leaves the impression that Sukhodaya was not a very important kingdom during the time of his father and elder brother who preceded him, and its greatness and importance really date from his time. We cannot rule out altogether the possibility that Indrapatindrāditya who was formally consecrated at Sukhodaya by the son-in-law of

the Kambuja king after the defeat of the Kambuja general was no other than Rāma Khamheng himself, the name Indrapatindrāditya being composed of the name of his benefactor (Indrabhūpati) and his own grandfather Indrāditya. This is undoubtedly a mere hypothesis for the present, but we cannot discard it simply because it does not tally with the current views on the subject which are, however, not based on any solid ground.

Rāma Khamheng claims in his Inscription to have made extensive conquests, and occupied territories belonging to Kambuja. CheuTa-Kuan, writing of Kambuja in 1296 or 97 A.D. refers to the devastation of the country in the recent wars with Siam. The Sukhodaya Inscription refers to a fight between Kambuja general and the son-in-law of the Kambuja king allied with a Thai Chief of Siam. All these may refer to the different episodes in the struggle between the son and son-in-law of the Kambuja king Jayavarman VIII. This civil war then must have taken place sometime before the end of the reign of this king in 1295 or 1296 A.D. This seems to follow from the statement in the Mangalārtha Temple Inscription that Jayavarman VIII abdicated in favour of his son-in-law. But although this may be justly regarded as a very weak argument against the obvious inference from CheuTa-Kuan's statement, quoted above, it is to be noted that we cannot reject the idea of a civil war taking place long before the end of Jayavarman's reign without upsetting some of the generally accepted views of historical events. For apart from all speculative theories on the identification of Phā Muang, the broad fact remains that he, a son-in-law of the ruling king of Kambuja, fought with a Kambuja general near Sukhodaya. Although this cannot be precisely dated it could hardly have taken place in 1295 or 1296 A.D. when king Rāma Khamheng must have, according to the generally accepted view

9 The Mangalārtha Temple Ins. refers to Śrīndravarman as Śrīndra-bhūpati (V. XLI) and Śrīndrabhūpa (XLVIII).

based on Sukhodaya Inscription, thoroughly established his power over Sukhodaya and an extensive region round it, and we can hardly think of a Kambuja prince defeating a Kambuja general and consecrating an allied chief as ruler over Sukhodaya.¹⁰ On the other hand it is difficult to explain away the incident by referring it to the reign of any other king of Kambuja. For, as we have seen above there are no reasonable grounds to place the foundation of Sukhodaya by Indrāditya before 1243 A.D. when Jayavarman VIII ascended the throne, and the fight between the Kambuja general and the son-in-law of Kambuja king, referred to in the Sukhodaya Inscription, can only refer to a civil war in his reign.

In case our theory is right that this struggle was caused by the rivalry between Śrīndravarman and his brother-in-law over the succession to the throne, we can hardly place it long before 1275 A.D., and possibly the date is later. For in the Bantei Srei Inscription of Śrīndravarman the earth is congratulated on its deliverance, by a young king, from the thorns and brambles which had grown up during the reign of an old king.¹¹ This shows that Śrīndravarman was a young man when he ascended the throne in 1295 or 1296 A.D. It is hardly likely therefore that he would have been old enough to contest the throne long before c. 1275 A.D.

The reference to the thorns and brambles during the reign of the old king Jayavarman VIII probably reflects the true condition of things, and in the light of what has been suggested above we may provisionally reconstruct the history of the period as follows:—

Jayavarman VIII, in his old age, nominated Śrīndravarman, his son-in-law, as his successor and appointed him

¹⁰ Of course we can explain this on the basis of the theory advanced in this paper if we identify Bāng Klāng Thao with Ram Khamheng.

¹¹ *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXV, p. 395.

as governor over western provinces including Siam. His son thereupon took up arms to defend his right. Thus ensued a civil war in course of which battles were fought in Siam. The conquest of the Thai Kingdom of Nan Chao by Kublai Khan led to a movement of the warlike Thais towards the south, and Śrīndravarman enlisted their support by offering large rewards and concessions. In particular, he won over a Thai Chief (either Indrāditya or Rama Khamheng) by consecrating him as king of Sukhodaya and offering him virtual independence and suzerainty over Siam. With their help he defeated his brother-in-law and imprisoned him, but did not ascend the throne till some years later when the old king abdicated in his favour. The palace-intrigues and the general insecurity of the times are indicated by the fact that Śrīndravarman, even after he became king, seldom ventured to come out in public and was clad, on those rare occasions, by an iron coat of mail, to guard himself from assassins. The civil war led to political troubles at home and abroad, but its most important effect was the foundation of a strong Thai kingdom in Siam with its capital at Sukhodaya.

The date of accession of Jayavarman II

BY DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR

The accession of Jayavarman II, the king of Kambuja, in 724 Śaka (=802 A.D.) was regarded as a fixed point in Kambuja chronology till Coëdès propounded a new theory in 1928. He discussed the question in connection with an inscription in the temple of Lobok Srot which was issued in 703 Śaka during the reign of a king Jayavarman, and observed as follows: "When I first edited the inscription (*BEFEO.*, V, p. 419) Jayavarman II was believed to have reigned till 791 Ś. and it was therefore impossible to attribute this inscription to him without assigning him a reign of 90 years and a longevity of at least 110 years; and I provisionally numbered this king as Jayavarman I (*bis*). But since according to the new chronology I have established at the beginning of this note, Jayavarman II died in 776 Ś. it is not at all impossible that it was he who had founded the temple of Lobok Srot, perhaps immediately after his return from Java and at the beginning of his reign at Indrapur. But this is merely a hypothesis to which I draw attention in passing. If it comes to be verified, it will furnish a valuable chronological data and prove that Jayavarman II returned from Java before 781 A.D."¹

Regarding the prevalent opinion about the date of Jayavarman's accession he remarks elsewhere in the same article that the reign of Jayavarman II did not really commence in 724 Ś. as is generally held, but that date marks the foundation of his capital on Mt. Mahendra.²

In view of the great scholarship of M. Coëdès and his unrivalled knowledge of Kambuja history, any hypothesis

propounded by him is likely to meet general acceptance. This alone can explain the readiness with which some scholars have accepted the new theory without any further examination. For there seems to be hardly any valid ground—and none has been urged by Coëdes—for taking 724 Ś. as the date of the foundation of the capital on Mahendraparvata. Following the usual tradition in Kambuja epigraphy, the authors of several inscriptions have referred to the date of commencement of Jayavarman's reign, and no reason has been shown why that date should be associated with a particular incident in the reign of Jayavarman II, and not regarded, as in all other cases, as the date of his accession. It is true that the reference to Mahendraparvata is found in some of these verses, as for example.

“*Āsīd=āvāridher=uruvīm vahan=ved-ārdha-
bhūdharaiḥ* |

*Rājā Śrī-Jayavarmma=eti Mahendra-ādri-
kṛt-āspadaḥ* ||³

Here the expression Mahendrādi° is a qualifying epithet of the king and it would be a far-fetched interpretation to regard it as qualifying the date. But fortunately there are verses in several other records which clearly refer the accession of Jayavarman II to 724 Ś. without any reference whatsoever to his capital on Mahendraparvata.⁴ The most interesting evidence about the correct interpretation of this verse is, however, furnished by Prea Kev Ins.⁵ It

3 Prasat Trapan Run Ins., V. XIV; *Ibid.*, p. 63.

4 Cf. *e.g.*, the following:—

(a) *Āsīd bhūpo mahāvārśo Veda-yugm-ādri-rājya-bhāk* |
Nāmnā Śrī Jayavarmma yaḥ khyāto bhūmau manur=
yyathā ||

(Prasat Kak Po Ins., V. IV, *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXXVII, p. 389.

(b) *(catu)r-bhuj-ācalorvī-(dh)ṛc=catur-bh(u)ja iv=āpara(h)* |

(Phnom Prah Vihear Ins., V. A. 4, *ISCC.*, p. 533).

5 VV. A. 10. B. 2. *ISCC.*, pp. 104, 106.

contains two verses denoting the commencement of the reigns of two kings of Kambuja which run as follows :

- (a) " *Āsīd = Śrī-Sūryavarmm = eti Veda-dvi-bila-
rājya-bhāk |*
- (b) *Āsīd-Kamvuja-rājendro Veda-dvi-naga-
rājya-bhāk ||*

The similarity of the two expressions, in the same inscription, leaves no doubt that in both cases the date was meant to be that of the accession of the king. There is no doubt that the second verse quoted above refers to Jayavarman II and as such we must regard 724 as the date of his accession.

So, the significance of the date 724 is clear. As regards Cœdès' theory that the king Jayavarman of Lobok Srot Ins., dated 703 Ś., was identical with Jayavarman II, it has been demolished, as Cœdès was the first to admit⁶, by the discovery of another inscription, dated 692 Śaka (=770 A.D.), at Prah That Prah Srei, of the reign of Jayavarman. For it is now more reasonable to identify the two kings mentioned in these records, and obviously he cannot be identified with Jayavarman II whose reign in that case would cover the period 770-854 A.D.

There is thus no reason whatsoever to disregard the clear statement in the epigraphic records that Jayavarman II came to the throne in 724 Śaka (=802 A.D.). It appears that Cœdès himself never definitely abandoned this old view in favour of his new hypothesis, for even long after it was propounded he gave the date of Jayavarman II as 802-854 A.D.⁷ And so does Parmentier.⁸ But unfortunately other scholars were less cautious and accepted Cœdès' theory as a settled fact. Thus Dr. B. R. Chatterji⁹,

6 BEFEO., Vol. XXXVI, p. 10, fn. 9.

7 BEFEO., Vol. XXXIV, p. 421.

8 Ibid., Vol. XXXV, p. 65.

9 JGIS., Vol. VI, pp. 144-145. On p. 144 Dr. Chatterji places the reign of Jayavarman II from "latter part of the 9th century to

P. Stern¹⁰ and P. Dupont¹¹ have accepted 724 Ś. as the date of the foundation of Mahendraparvata, and placed the accession of Jayavarman II towards the end of the eighth century A.D. even long after Dr. Cœdès, who originally propounded these views, had given them up. In any case the accession of Jayavarman II must be placed in 802 A.D.

854 A.D." 9th is obviously a misprint for 8th. He fully accepts Cœdès' theory on p. 145 (last three lines).

¹⁰ *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 614, 616; Vol. XXXVIII, pp. 111, 175, 179.

¹¹ Dupont sometimes gives 802 A.D. as the date of accession (*BEFEO.*, Vol. XXXVI, pp. 416, 630) but sometimes takes it as the date of the institution of the Devarāja cult (*Ibid.*, Vol. XXXVIII, p. 429).

Progress of Greater Indian Research during the last twenty-five years (1917-42)

—A Supplement*

Preface

From early times a shallow generalization has often drawn the picture of India as standing aloof from the currents of the world's history. This view seems to find its support in the remarkable physical features of the land and not less, in the unique type of its civilization. With its frontiers girt round by impassable mountains and forests as well as the circling seas, nature herself appears to have doomed India to a life of splendid isolation. India's remarkable institution of caste as well as its distinctive systems of religion and philosophy would seem further to have formed an insurmountable barrier between its people and those of the outside world. And yet at the present moment it is but a historical truism to assert that never in all the centuries of its past existence our country has ceased to maintain active contact by land as well as by sea with countries and peoples beyond its frontiers. This contact, it must further be noted, was not confined to the exchange of material goods, but extended also to the domain of ideas.

In this grand and ceaseless process of contact with neighbouring lands, India's role has not been that of a mere passive recipient. More and more the unimpeachable evidence of history is proving the profound influence exercised by her all-pervasive culture upon outside lands, specially those of South-Eastern and Eastern Asia. Thus Sir John Marshall, who cannot certainly be accused of exaggerating Indian influence, after referring in a recent pronouncement to 'the amazingly vital and flexible character of Indian Art' and the common capacity of Indian and

* Continued from *JGIS.*, Vol. IX, No. 2, p. 141.

Greek Art 'to adapt themselves to suit the needs of every country, race and religion with which they came into contact', writes as follows:—"To know Indian Art in India alone, is to know but half its story. To apprehend it to the full, we must follow it in the wake of Buddhism, to Central Asia, China and Japan; we must watch it assuming new forms and breaking into new beauties as it spreads over Tibet and Burma and Siam; we must gaze in awe at the unexampled grandeur of its creations in Cambodia and Java. In each of these countries, Indian Art encounters a different racial genius, a different local environment, and under their modifying influence it takes on a different garb". (*Foreword to Reginald Le May, Buddhist Art in Siam, Cambridge, 1938*). What is true of art, is true of other branches of civilization as well. As a brilliant French writer has recently observed:—"In the high plateau of Eastern Iran, in the oases of Serindia, in the arid wastes of Tibet, Mongolia and Manchuria, in the ancient civilised lands of China and Japan, in the lands of the primitive Mons and Khmers and other tribes in Indo-China, in the countries of the Malayo-Polynesians, in Indonesia and Malay, India left the indelible impress of her high culture not only upon religion, but also upon art and literature, in a word, all the higher things of the spirit' (Réné Grousset, *The Civilisations of the East*, vol. II, p. 276). Out of this amazing expansion of India's unique culture there rose and flourished in the first millennium of the Christian era, to quote the authoritative words of the French author just mentioned, 'a Greater India politically as little organised as Greater Greece, but morally equally homogeneous'. But as Greater India has excelled in extent and duration its Greek counterpart, so much has the recovery of its lost history cost greater scholarly effort and enterprise. This process of rediscovery of Greater India, slow and fitful at the beginning, has taken larger and larger strides with the march of time. In the following pages an attempt is made to trace the extraordinary advance which Greater Indian

research has achieved during the last quarter of a century. This achievement, it will be seen, has been largely secured by the organization of expedition and research under the auspices of the various advanced Governments of the modern world. Next to the Governments, the learned Societies of various lands have co-operated in unearthing and interpreting the records of the past history of Greater India.

The cumulative labours of a host of explorers, archaeologists, art-critics and historians of various lands, gathering in momentum during the last quarter of a century, have added a new and glorious chapter to the history of our country. In the teeth of blind ignorance and narrow prejudice, they have definitely established India's claim to rank among the great civilising nations of the world. To quote the pertinent remarks of Sir Charles Eliot (*Hinduism and Buddhism*, Vol. I, p. xii):—'Scant justice is done to India's position in the world by those histories which recount the exploits of her invaders and leave the impression that her own people were a feeble dreamy folk, sundered from the rest of mankind by their sea and mountain frontiers. Such a picture takes no account of the intellectual conquests of the Hindus. Even their political conquests were not contemptible and are remarkable for the distance, if not the extent, of the territories occupied.....But such military or commercial invasions are insignificant compared with the spread of Indian thought.' As the eminent French savant Sylvain Lévi writes (*Abel Bergaigne et l'Indianisme* in *Revue Blue*, tome 45, 1890, tr. by Kalidas Nag in *Modern Review*, Dec. 1921):—'From Persia to the Chinese Sea, from the icy regions of Siberia to the islands of Java and Borneo, from Oceania to Socotra, India has propagated her beliefs, her genius, her tales and her civilization. She has left indelible imprints on one-fourth of the human race in course of a long succession of centuries. She has the right to reclaim in universal history the rank that ignorance has refused her for a long time and to hold her place amongst the great

nations summarising and symbolising the spirit of Humanity.' How the discovery of this grand truth is reacting in the minds of India's greatest sons is best expressed in the pregnant words of Rabindranath Tagore (*Foreword to JGIS.*, vol. I, No. 1, January 1934):—"To know my country in truth one has to travel to that age, when she realised her soul and thus transcended her physical boundaries, when she revealed her being in a radiant magnanimity which illumined the Eastern horizon, making her recognised as their own by those in alien shores who were awakened into a surprise of life ; and not now when she has withdrawn herself within a narrow barrier of obscurity, into a miserly pride of exclusiveness, into a poverty of mind that dumbly revolves around itself in an unmeaning repetition of a part that has lost its light and has no message to the pilgrims of the future." It is to be earnestly hoped that the amazingly rich record of progress in the rediscovery of Greater India, that is revealed in these pages, will usher in a period of active research carried out by her own sons in a field they have sadly neglected so far.

CONTENTS

Afghanistan:

French monopoly of archaeological exploration, 1; 'Græco-Buddhist' and 'Irano-Buddhist' schools of Art, 1; Discoveries at Hadda, 2; at Bamiyan, 2, 3; at Khair Khaneh, 3; at Begram 3, 4; at Fondukistan, 4.

Central Asia:

Chance-finds of manuscripts and antiquities, 4; expeditions of M. A. Stein, 4, 5; German, Russian, Japanese, French and Chinese expeditions, 5; reports of expeditions of Stein, Grünwedel and Le Coq, 6, 7, 8; of Russian and Japanese expeditions, 7, 8; publications of objects of art by Le Coq, Pelliot and Stein, 8, 9; catalogues of Waley, Andrews, 9; topics and styles of Central Asian art, 10; discoveries of Indian texts, 10; publications of Sanskrit texts, 11, 12; of Kharoṣṭhī texts in North-West Prākṛit, 12, 13; of Indian literary texts in Karasharian and Kuchean languages, 14, 15; in Sogdian and Khotanese languages, 15, 16; in the ancient Turki language, 16; in the Tangut (Si-hia) language, 16; in the Tibetan language, 17; publications of Chinese Buddhist documents, 17.

Tibet:

Publications of new catalogues of Tibetan canon, 18; of Tibetan Buddhist texts, 18, 19; catalogues of Tibetan collections in museums, 19; works on Tibetan religion, 20; explorations of Guiseppe Tucci, 20, 21; of Rāhula Sāṅkrṭyāyana, 21.

Mongolia and Manchuria:

Publications of Mongolian Buddhist texts, 22; discovery of Manchurian Kanjur, 22.

Burma:

Progress of archaeological studies down to first decade of twentieth century, 23, 24; archaeological discoveries of Charles Duroiselle, 24, 25, 26; growth of museums, 26; progress of studies in Burmese religious history, 26, 27, 28; in Burmese art, 28, 29; in Burmese literary history, 30; in general history of Burma, 30.

Siam:

Siam in pre-T'ai period, 30; State organization of archaeological research, 30, 31; researches of George Coedès in Siamese archaeology, 31, 33; in Siamese art and architecture, 32, 33; researches of other scholars, 33; publications of Reginald Le May, 34; explorations of H. G. Quaritch Wales, 35; of the French School of the Far East, 36; works on general history of Siam, 36; Indian influences upon Siam, 36, 37.

Cambodia:

Funan and Cambodia, 38; early publications of Cambodian Sanskrit inscriptions, 38; foundation of the French School of the Far East, 38; systematic surveys of antiquities and preparation of bibliographies, 39; recent progress in the study of inscriptions, 40; in archaeological exploration and research, 41; the Angkor group of monuments, 42-44; the new chronology of Khmer art, 44; conservation of monuments, 44; growth of museums 44-45; critical study of Cambodian art, 45; relation of Khmer to Indian art, 46-47; symbolism of Cambodian monuments, 47-48; works on general history of Cambodia and its civilization, 48; the French School and the Buddhist cultural renaissance in Cambodia, 48-49; Indian influences upon Cambodian civilization, 49.

Champa:

Indian culture in Champā, 50; early studies in the art, archaeology and general history of Champā, 50-51; progress of recent studies, 51, 52, 53.

Malayasia:

Indian culture in Malayasia, 53-54.

1. Java:

Early studies in Javanese history and culture, 54-55; the Committee in Netherlands-India for the archaeological explorations in Java and Madura, 55-56; the growth of museums, 56; progress of other branches of research, 56-57; recent progress in archaeological exploration and research, 58; in epigraphical studies, 58, 59; in critical study of Javanese art, 59, 60; relation of Javanese to Indian art, 60; the Stūpa of Barabudur, 61, 62, 63; the temples of Prambanan and Panataran, 63; Javanese bronzes, 63, 64; Javanese dances and shadow-plays, 64; the growth of museums and learned societies, 64, 65; recent studies in Old-Javanese religious beliefs and practices, 65, 66; in Old-Javanese literature, 66, 67; in Old-Javanese history and culture, 67, 68.

2. Bali:

Studies in Balinese art and archaeology, 68, 69; in Balinese literature, 69; in Balinese general history, 69.

3. Borneo and Celebes:

Studies in Sanskrit inscriptions from Borneo, 70; in Brahmanical and Buddhist sculptures of Borneo, 70; the Buddha image of Celebes, 70, 71; works on general history, 71.

4. Sumatra:

Cœdès's reconstruction of the history of Śrīvijaya and its criticisms, 71, 72; the Buddhist sculptures of Palembang, 72; explorations of F.M. Schnitger, 73.

5. Malay Peninsula:

Indian culture in Malay, 73, 74; discoveries of Sanskrit inscriptions, 74, of Brahmanical and Buddhist antiquities, 74, 75; explorations of H. G. Quaritch Wales, 75, 76; works on general history of Malay, 76, 77.

Ceylon:

Indian culture in Ceylon, 77, 78; early studies in Sinhalese art, archaeology and culture, 78, 79, 80; recent progress in Sinhalese archaeological studies, 80, 81, 82; in the study of Sinhalese art, 82; in the study of Sinhalese culture and general history, 82, 83.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS

P. 1. last line: *After 'archaeologists' add:*

'At the site of Balkh, 'Mother of Cities' and capital of ancient Bactria, A. Foucher carried out (1923-25) a number of prolonged excavations, of which a detailed report is expected to be published in Tome I of the *Memoirs of the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan*. Foucher's general conclusions are summed up in his short work *Étude sur l'art bouddhique de l'Inde* (Maison franco-japonaise, Tokyo)'.

P. 3. line 22: *After 'Sarvāstivādins' add:*

'About this time J. Hackin published a summary of explorations of the School in French under the title *The Work of the French Archaeological Delegation in Afghanistan (1922-32)*, Paris, 1933'.

P. 4. line 14: *After 'January and July 1940' add:*

'In 1936 chance excavations brought to light at Kunduz seven stucco heads (being the first Buddhist sculptures found so far to the north of the Hindu-kush) as well as the remains of a Buddhist apsidal monastery. The stucco fragments have been dated on stylistic grounds between the first century B.C. and the first century A. D. by J. Hackin (*L'art Greco-bouddhique de la Bactriane*, Kabul, 1937). In the summer of 1938 a British expedition led by Evert Barger excavated a number of sites in the Swat Valley and carried out an archaeological reconnaissance in Northern Afghanistan. The detailed report of the expedition has been published under the title *Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Oxus territories of Afghanistan* by Evert Barger and Philip Wright (*Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 64, Delhi, 1941)'.

'In his work *The Wall-paintings of India, Central Asia and Ceylon. A Comparative Study: With an Introductory Essay on the Nature of Buddhist Art* by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Boston 1938 the author has characterized the paintings in the vault of the 115-foot Buddha niche at Bamiyan as belonging to the Sassanian style. By contrast the niche of the other colossal Buddha and its groups of smaller caves display the Indian style. The decorative scheme in the vault, according to the same author, was a gigantic Buddha now effaced, surrounded by a host of Buddhas, Bodhisattvas and Apsarases'.

P. 6. line 25: *After 'ancient city' add:*

'which show the Hellenistic Gandhāra art to be yielding to Sassanian and East Indian influences'.

P. 6. line 32: *For 'three' read 'five'.*

P. 7. line 23: *After 'forth' add:*

'From Karakhoto (The Black city) forming part of the ancient Tangut (Hsi-hsia) kingdom Stein acquired a mass of wooden sculptures illustrating Jātaka scenes as well as figures of enthroned Buddhas, of Buddhist scenes and of Brahmanical deities mounted upon their *Vāhanas*.'

P. 8. line 11: *After 'Indian script' add:*

'The results of Hackin's explorations on the site of Bazaklik already visited by Grünwedel were recorded in his work *Recherches archéologiques en Asie centrale* (Paris, 1931) where he mentioned Buddhist sanctuaries with *maṇḍalas* or apparitions of Tāntrik divinities'.

P. 10. line 12: *After 'Buddhist Paradise' add:*

'The Japanese scholar Eiichi Matsumoto identified (*Bukkyō Bijutsu*, No. 19, Tokyo, 1933) a number of such paintings from the *Caves of the Thousand Buddhas* as representing the defeat of the Brahman Raudrākṣa by Śāriputra in a contest of supernatural

powers, while another painting from Tun-huang was identified by him (*Kokka*, No. 515, Tokyo, 1933) as referring to the Bodhisattva Kṣitigarbha. A number of mural or silk paintings from Tun-huang and Turfan representing the paradise of Bhaiṣajyaguruvaidurya-prabhāsa was afterwards identified and explained by the same scholar (*Kokka*, No. 523, 1934). The mural and other Buddhist paintings as well as the Buddhist images from the *Caves of the Thousand Buddhas* have since been thoroughly examined by him in a Japanese work bearing the title *Studies in the Paintings of Tun-huang*, 2 vols., Tokyo 1937(?)

P. 12. line 11: *For Keinere read Kleinere.*

P. 12. line 26: *After 'Central Asian Sanskrit canon' add:*

'Mention may be made in this connection of Helmuth Hoffmann's edition of the fragments of the *Āṭānāṭika Sūtra* from the Central Asian Sanskrit Canon in the same series, *Kleinere Sanskrit Texte*, heft v, Leipzig 1939'.

P. 13. line 26: *After Dhammapada add:*

'To T. Burrow we are also indebted for the publication (*Further Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Niya*, BSOS. IX) of the text and translation of 18 tablets of Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions discovered by Stein in his last Central Asian expedition in 1930'.

P. 14. line 23: *After 'Tocharian language' add:*

'Meanwhile E. Leumann published (Strassburg 1919) the Tocharian text (with a German translation) of the *Maitreyasamiti* of the poet Āryacandra'.

P. 15. line 18: *After Heidelberg 1928 add:*

'The revised readings of some of these fragments along with the readings of certain new fragments of Soghdian Manuscripts were published by E. Benveniste (*Notes Sogdiennes*, BSOS. IX)'.

P. 15. line 24: *For 'Eassai' read 'Essai'.*

Ibid., line 26: *After 'E. Benveniste (Paris 1929)' add:*

'The facsimilies of Soghdian manuscripts preserved

in the Bibliothèque Nationale have been published by Benveniste under the title '*Monumenta Linguarum Asiae Minoris*, vol. III, *Codices Sogdiani* (Copenhagen 1940)'.

P. 16. lines 1-8: For 'A complete poem in Khotanese Śaka ... Vijaya Śūra read the following:

'The longest literary work in Khotanese Śaka, consisting of an epic in 25 chapters relating to the legend of the future saviour Maitreya and derived entirely from Indian inspiration, was edited with a German translation by E. Leumann and published (1933-34) after his death by Manu Leumann. It bears (in German) the title *The North Aryan (Sakish) doctrinal poem of Buddhism*. A series of studies of Khotanese texts in the collection of the British Museum and of the India Office has been recently published by H. W. Bailey under the title *Hvatanica* (BSOS. VIII—X). Among the most interesting of these texts are a fragment of a Khotanese translation of the *Siddhasāra* of Ravigupta (BSOS. VIII), a Sanskrit-Khotanese bilingual text (*Ibid.* IX) and a number of texts referring to gods and goddesses (largely of Indian origin) that were worshipped in ancient Khotan (*Ibid.* X). In BSOS. VIII, H. W. Bailey and E. W. Johnston jointly edited a fragment of the *Uttaratantra* (a fundamental work of Northern Buddhism) with Khotanese Śaka annotations. To H. W. Bailey we owe the publication of the text and translation of the Khotanese version of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (BSOS., X. Parts 2 & 3). He has also edited (BSOS. IX) the supposed Sanskrit original of the Khotanese *Jātakastava* of Jñānayaśas. This work, which is preserved in the Tohoku Catalogue of the Sde-dge edition of the Tibetan Bstan-hgyur, consists of the Sanskrit text written in Tibetan script with inter-linear Tibetan gloss'.

P. 16. line 22: After S. P. A. W. 1931 add:

'Mention may be made in this connection of the important paper (in German) of H. Stöner on *The Central Asian Sanskrit Texts in Brāhmī Script.* (SKPAW., XLIV. 1904). A Turkish fragment in Brāhmī was afterwards published along with a glossary of Turkish words by H. W. Bailey (BSOS. IX)'.
 P. 17. line 8: *After* 'surprisingly' *add*.

'The Tibetan fragments of the Rāma story have since been investigated by M. Lalou (*J. A.*, 1936)'.

P. 17. line 34: *After* Peiping 1930-31 *add*:

'A brief but useful, survey of Indian cultural influences in Central Asia, Tibet, China, Further India and Malayasia has since been given by F. W. Thomas in his *Calcutta University Lectures* under the title *Indianism and its Expansion*, Calcutta 1942. In the course of this work the author pays a well-deserved tribute to the work of Japanese scholars, of whom he says (*op. cit.* p. 96):—'In the study of ancient Indian originals no other country has produced scholars combining to the same extent a facility in dealing with the sources and the painstaking scholarly method'.

P. 18. line 26: *For* K'ang-shi' *read* K'ang-hsi'.

P. 18. line 38: *Omit* Dharmakīrti's *Pramāṇavārttika*, *ed.* Rahula Sankrityayana, JBORS (1938-39).

P. 19. line 9: *Omit* by Vallée Poussin and

P. 19. line 12: *After* Calcutta 1931 *add*:

'The authorship of the *Nyāyapraveśa* is still disputed between Dinnāga and his pupil Śāṅkaraśvāmin. For a good summary of this discussion see the *Introduction*, pp. vi-xiii to the *Nyāyapraveśa*, Pt. I, Sanskrit text with commentaries critically edited by A. B. Dhruva (GOS. No. XXXVIII, Baroda, 1930). The author's tentative conclusion is that 'the *Nyāyapraveśa* is a work composed by Śāṅkaraśvāmin to facilitate entrance

into the *Nyāyadvāra* ('the Gate of Logic') which is a work of his master Diñnāga'. *Ālambanaparīkṣā* of Diñnāga has recently been edited in its restored Sanskrit form with an accompanying English translation and copious extracts from Dharmapāla's commentary by N. Aiyaswami Sastri. (Adyar Library, Madras 1942). To this list we have to add the publication of the text and translation (in German) of *Aśvaghoṣa's Buddhacarita* by Freiderich Weller, Leipzig 1926. This work consists of two parts, Part I, containing the text and translation of cantos 1-8 and Part II those of cantos 9-17.'

P. 19 line 25: *After Part II, 1932, add:*

'Some valuable hints for the collection of materials for a Tibetan bibliography are given by Andrew Vostrikov in his paper, *Some corrections and critical remarks on Dr. Johan van Manen's Contribution to the Bibliography of Tibet* (BSOS., VIII, Pt. 1, 1935).'

P. 19 line 32: *After Hanoi 1935 add:*

'A classified and illustrated catalogue of the Loo Collection of Tibetan Paintings prepared by Mlle. Raymonde Linossier was published under the title *Les peintures tibétaines de la collection Loo* in the *Études d'Orientalisme publiées par le Musée Guimet à la Mémoire de Raymonde Linossier*, Paris, 1932.'

P. 21 line 12: *After temples add:*

'Of great historical, aesthetic as well as iconographical interest are the frescoes of *tāntric* deities executed by Indian artists c. 1000 A.D., which adorn the walls of some of these temples.'

P. 21 line 28: *After Tibetan Libraries add:*

'The Bihar & Orissa Research Society has since published a series of works under the title *Sanskrit Texts from Tibet*. Among these we may specially mention the *Adhyardhaśataka* ['Hymn of one hundred

and fifty (verses)] by Māṭṛceta, edited with preface and two appendices by Rahula Sankrityayana. This edition is based upon Sanskrit texts recovered by the author from Tibetan monastic libraries as well as the Tibetan and Chinese versions and Hoernle's edition of the Central Asian Manuscript Fragments in the work *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turkestan*. Another notable work of the same series is the *Pramāṇavārttika* by Dharmakīrti which is a commentary on the *Pramāṇasamuccaya* of Dinnāga, 'the father of Indian Mediaeval logic'.

P. 21. line 35: *For Asia Major VIII read 1929, Verlag der Asia Major.*

P. 26. line 8: *For ASI 1915 read ASI 1915-16.*

P. 31. line 14: *For Vajirañāna read Vajirañāṇa.*

P. 32. line 18: *Omit and so forth.*

P. 33. line 16: *For 1930 read 1937.*

P. 34. line 24: *For U'kong read U'tong.*

P. 35. line 25: *After Gupta School add:*

'The reference is to Coëdès' paper *Note sur les quelques sculptures provenant de Srideb (Siam) in Études d'Orientalisme Linossier.*'

P. 39. line 24: *After regions add:*

'An index of Aymonier's great work was published by George Coëdès in *BCAI.*, 1911.'

P. 40. line 3: *Add a new paragraph.*

'We may refer in the present place to the activities of the Commission Archeologique de l'Indo-chine attached to the archaeological section of the *Comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, which was established by a decree of the Minister of Public Instruction in 1908. It started in the same year an important *Bulletin* to receive and examine all communications relating to the conservation of archaeological monuments in Indo-China. In actual practice the activities of the school extended far beyond its narrow

programme. The successive numbers of its *Bulletin* contained inventories of Indo-Chinese sculptures existing in public and private collections within and outside France, such as the *Catalogue des pieces originales de sculpture khmère conservees au Musée indo-chinois du Trocadero et au Musée Guimet* by George Coédès (BCAL., 1910), and the *Catalogue des sculptures Cames et Khmeres du Musée royal d'ethnographie à Berlin* by H. Stönnner (BCAL., 1912). Among other topics treated in the *Bulletin* were various questions of Indo-Chinese archaeology and epigraphy. Such were *Les bas reliefs de Baphuon* by Louis Finot (BCAL., 1910), *Les bas-reliefs d'Angkor Vat* by George Coédès (BCAL., 1911) and *Les inscriptions du Bayon* by George Coédès, (BCAL., 1913). In the same Journal (BCAL., 1911) Coédès published his *Index Alphabetique pour le Cambodge de M. Aymonier*. The Commission finally published a number of monographs such as *Le Bayon d'Angkor Thom, Bas-reliefs publiés par les soins de la commission Archéologique de l'Indo-chine*, (2 vols. Paris, 1910-13) and *Les Monuments du Cambodge, Étude d'architecture khmère publiés par L. Delaporte*, fasc. 1, 1914, fasc. 2, 1920, fasc. 3'.

P. 42. line 34: After Dharanindravarman II add:

'See Coédès, *Journal Asiatique*, 1920, p. 96'.

P. 44. line 4: After Buddha add:

'A statue of Vajradhara at Bantei Chmar has been since identified by Goloubew (*JISOA.*, vol. V, 1937) as a portrait of Jayavarman VII, 'the living Buddha'.

P. 45. line 12: For 1921-24 read 1921-26.

P. 47. line 27: After has held add: (*IAL.*, 1937).

P. 47. line 34: After the same scholar add: loc. cit.

P. 48. line 7: After monuments add:

'In the branch of Cambodian iconography we may mention the comprehensive paper (in French) by Louis Finot called *Lokēśvara en Indo-chine* (*Études*

Asiatiques I). Some supplementary notes have been added by U. N. Ghoshal, *Note on a type of Lokeśvara in Cambodge*, (*JGIS.*, V. January, 1938), *Some Indian Parallels of Lokeśvara types in Indo-China*, (*Ibid.*, July, 1938). The iconography of the Khmer 'Crowned Buddha' has been discussed by P. Mus (*BEFEO.*, XXVIII), while Bosch has contributed (*BEFEO.*, XXXI) a valuable monograph (in French) on *The Liṅgodbhavamūrti of Śiva in Indo-China*.

P. 48. line 24: After 'civilization' add:

'In *BEFEO.* 1929, Coedès has furnished new data bearing on the chronology and genealogy of the dynasty of kings from Jayavarman VI to Jayavarman VII'.

P. 48. line 36: After Laos add:

'started respectively in 1925 and 1915'.

P. 49. line 2: For students read studies. Add:

'Mention may be made in this connection of the various publications in which the French School has sought from time to time to communicate its activities. In 1917 Émile Senart presented his report on the activities of the School to the famous *Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres* in Paris. His example was followed successively by H. Cordier who submitted two *Reports* covering the period from 1918 to 1920, by L. Finot who presented his *Report* for the years 1920 to 1926 and by A. Foucher who did the same for the period 1926 to 1930. Meanwhile Finot published (*BEFEO.*, 1921) a complete summary of the activities of the School from its origin to 1920. The school, which celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary by publishing two volumes of *Études Asiatiques* in 1925, started a quarterly series of chronicles (*Cahiers*) in 1934'.

P. 51 line 8: For vol. VIII read vol. VII.

P. 52 line 2: After 'so forth' add:

'It was followed by another volume containing the plates and albums.'

- P. 52. line 15: For *BEFEO.*, XXXII, read *BEFEO.*, XXXI.
- P. 56. line 7: For *Caṇḍi* read *Chaṇḍi*.
- P. 58. lines 23-26: For on the site of.....inscription read.
 'These were noticed in the *Oudheid-kundig Verslag*, (1937), while a popular account was given by A. J. Bernot-Kempers in *ABIA.*, XII, pp. 51-53.
- P. 53. lines 34-35: For These have been.....beliefs read.
 'These remains were reported in *Oudheidkundig Verslag* 1936, while a popular account was published by W. F. Stutterheim in *ABIA.*, XI, pp. 25-30'.
- P. 63. line 32: After Batavia-Leiden 1925 add:
 In his paper *The Rāmāyaṇa in Indonesia* (BSOS., IV) the same scholar has compared parallel versions of the *Rāmāyaṇa* in Indo-China (Ramakien in Siam, Hikajat Seri Rama in Malay, Serat Rama in Java and Madura, *Rāmāyaṇa* in Bali) with one another and with the Indian versions'.
- P. 66. line 15: After *B.K.I.*, vol. XC. add:
 'In her learned work *Ganesa. A monography on the elephant-faced god. With an introduction by Alfred Foucher*. Oxford, 1936. Alice Getty described the well-known Javanese images of Ganesa along with the Buddhist Ganesas of Endere and Tun Huang in Central Asia and the Ganesas of Cambodia and Champa'.
- P. 73. line. 1: After *JGIS.*, vol. II, add:
 According to R. Heine-Geldern (*Archaeology and Art in Sumatra*), Gupta, South Indian and Javanese influences affected the Sumatran art prior to and during the Śrīvijaya period, but these could not efface the indigenous style'.
- P. 73. line 28: After the 7th century add:
 'We may refer lastly to the work of J. Tideman (*Hindoe-invloed in Noorde-lijk Batakland*, Amsterdam, 1936) describing Hindu-Javanese and South-Indian influences upon Batak culture'.
- P. 79. line 1: For called read call.

APPENDIX I

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology, Kern Institute, Leiden, vols. I-XII (1926-37), Leiden, 1928-1939.

Bibliographie Bouddhique, tomes I-VII (1928-36), Paris, 1930-37.

Bibliotheca indo-sinica. Dictionnaire bibliographique des ouvrages relatifs à l'Indo-Chine, par Henri Cordier.

Ibid., Tome I Birmanie, Assam, Siam et Laos, Paris 1912.

Ibid., Tome II Péninsule Malaise, Paris 1913.

Ibid., Tome III Indo-Chine Française, Paris 1914.

Ibid., Tome IV Indo-Chine Française, Paris 1914.

Ibid., Index, par Mme. M. A. Roland-Cabaton, Paris 1932.

Bibliographie de l'Indo-Chine Française (1913-26), par Paul Boudet et Rémy Bourgeois, Hanoi 1929.

Ibid. (1927-29), Hanoi 1932.

Ibid. 1930, Hanoi 1933.

Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique de l'Indo-Chine, Années 1917-30; II. L'archéologie indo-chinoise de 1917 à 1930, par L. Finot.

Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient, XXI (1921):—*L'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient depuis son origine jusqu'en 1920*.

Ibid. Index Generale des tomes I-XX.

Ibid. XXXII, 1932. Index Generale des tomes XXI-XXX.

APPENDIX II

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS OF PERIODICALS USED IN THE TEXT

- A. B. I. A.* : *Annual Bibliography of Indian Archaeology*,
Leyden.
- A. K. M.* : *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgen-
landes.*
- Ann. Rep.*
A. S. I. : *Annual Report of the Archaeological Survey
of India*, Delhi.
- B. C. A. I.* : *Bulletin de la Commission Archéologique
de l'Indo-chine*, Paris.
- B. E. F. E. O.* : *Bulletin de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême
Orient*, Hanoi.
- B. K. I.* : *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land— en Volken-
kunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, uitgegeven
door het Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-,
Land— en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-
Indië, The Hague.
- B. S. O. S.* : *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies*,
London.
- I. A. L.* : *Indian Art and Letters*, London.
- J. A.* : *Journal Asiatique*, Paris.
- J. A. O. S.* : *Journal of the American Oriental Society*,
Harvard.
- J. A. S. B.* : *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*,
Calcutta.
- J. B. O. R. S.* : *Journal of the Bihar & Orissa Research
Society*, Patna.
- J. G. I. S.* : *Journal of the Greater India Society*, Calcutta.
- J. R. A. S.* : *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great
Britain and Ireland*, London.
- J. R. A. S. M. B.* : *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Malay
Branch*, Singapore.

- J. I. S. O. A.:* *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Art*, Calcutta.
- J. S. S.:* *Journal of the Siam Society*, Bangkok.
- Med. der kon Ak. van Wet:* *Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde.*
- R. A. A.:* *Revue des Arts Asiatiques, Annales du Musée Guimet*, Paris.
- S. P. A. W.:* *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin.
- T. B. G.:* *Tijdschrift voor Indische Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, uitgegeven door het Koninklijke Bataviaasch Genootschap van kunsten en Wetenschappen, Batavia.
- Z. D. M. G.:* *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, Leipzig.

APPENDIX III

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS ON GREATER INDIA (1917-1942)

AFGHANISTAN

- Barger, Evert and Wright, Philip: *Excavations in the Swat Valley and Explorations in the Oxus territories of Afghanistan*. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India, No. 64, Delhi, 1941).
- Barthoux, J., *Les fouilles de Haḍḍa*, tome III, *Figures et figurines*. [Mémoires de la délégation archéologique en Afghanistan, tome IV], Paris, 1930.
- , *Les fouilles de Haḍḍa*, tome I, *Stūpas et sites*. [Mémoires tome IV]. Paris, 1933.
- Foucher, A., *Études sur l'art Bouddhique de l'Inde*, Tokyo.
- Godard, A., Godard, J., Hackin, J., *Les Antiquités Bouddhiques de Bāmīyan*, [Mémoires, tome II]. Paris-Bruzelles, 1928.
- Hackin, J., *L'oeuvre de la Délégation Archéologique française en Afghanistan (1922-32)*; I Archéologie bouddhique, Tokyo, 1933.
- , *L'art bouddhique de la Bactriane et l'origine de l'art gréco-bouddhique* (Bulletin archeologique publié par la section historique de l'Académie Afghane, fasc. 1, Kabul, 1937.
- Hackin, J., avec la collaboration de Carl, J.—*Nouvelles recherches archéologiques à Bāmīyan*, [Mémoires... tome, III]. Paris, 1933.
- , *Recherches archéologiques au Col de Khair Khaneh près de Kabul*, [Mémoires....., tome VII]. Paris, 1936.
- , avec la collaboration de Mme. J. R. Hackin—*Recherches archéologique à Begram*, tome I, texte, tome II, planches, [Mémoires...tome IX]. Paris, 1939.

Rowland, Benjamin, *The Wall-paintings of India, Central Asia and Ceylon: A Comparative Study. With an introductory essay on the Nature of Buddhist Art* by Ananda K. Coomaraswamy, Boston, 1938.

[For articles published in *JGIS.*, etc. see text].

CENTRAL ASIA

Andrews, F. H., *Catalogue of Wall Paintings from Ancient shrines in Central Asia and Seistan, recovered by Sir Aurel Stein*. Described by F. H. Andrews, Delhi, 1933.

———, *Central Asian Antiquities Museum, New Delhi. Descriptive Catalogue of Antiquities recovered by Sir Aurel Stein during his exploration in Central Asia, Kansu and Eastern Iran*. Delhi, 1935.

Burrow, T.,—*The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, Cambridge, 1937.

———, *A Translation of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*, London, 1940.

Chakravarti, N. P., *L'Udānavarga sanscrite*, Paris, 1930.

Gauthiot, R., et Benveniste, E., *Essai de grammaire Sogdienne*, 1^{re} partie par R. Gauthiot, Paris, 1921; 2^{me} partie par E. Benveniste, Paris, 1929.

Grünwedel, A., *Alt-Kutscha*, Berlin, 1920.

Hackin, J., *Recherches archéologiques en Asie Centrale*, (1931). Paris, 1936.

Hoffmann, Helmuth, *Bruchstücke des Āṭānāṭika Sūtra. aus den Zentral-asiatischen Sanskrit-Kanon der Buddhisten, Königlich Preussische Turfan Expeditionen, Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Heft. V.* Leipzig, 1939.

Kharoṣṭhī-inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan, Part I Text of inscriptions discovered at Niya site, 1901, transcribed and edited by A. M. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and E. Senart, Oxford 1920. *Part II Text of inscriptions discovered at the Niya, Endere and Lou-lan sites, 1906-7*, transcribed and edited (as above), Oxford, 1927. *Part III. Text of*

inscriptions discovered at the Niya and Lou-lan sites, 1913-14, transcribed and edited by E. J. Rapson and P. S. Noble, Oxford, 1929.

Konow, Sten, *Saṅga Studies*, London, 1932.

Kozloff-Filchner, *Mongolei, Amdo und die Tote Stadt Chara-Choto. Die Expedition der Russischen Geographischen Gesellschaft, 1907-9. Autorisierte Übersetzung von Dr. L. Breitfuss und P. G. Zeidler, Berlin, 1925.*

Le Coq, A. von, *Die Buddhistischen Spätantike in Mittelasien I Die Plastik; II Die Manichäischen Miniaturen; III Die Wandmalereien; IV Atlas zu den Wandmalereien; V Neue Bildwerke I; VI Neue Bildwerke II; VII Neue Bildwerke III (Ausgewählt und bearbeitet von E. Waldschmidt). Berlin, 1922-24.*

———, *Bilder-Atlas zur Kunst und Kultur-Geschichte Mittel-Asiens*, Berlin, 1925.

———, *Auf Hellas Spuren in Ost-Turkistan*, Leipzig, 1926 (English tr. by Anna Barwell under the title '*Buried Treasures of Chinese Turkestan; an account of the activities and adventures of the second and third German expeditions*', London, 1928).

Leumann, E., *Das Nordarische (Sakische) Lehrgedicht des Buddhismus. Text und Übersetzung. Aus dem Nachlass hg. von Manu Leumann. AKM., XX, Heft I 1933; Heft II 1934.*

Lévi, Sylvain, *Fragments de Textes Koutchéens. Udānavarga, Udānastotra, Udānālambkāra et Karmavibhaṅga publiés et traduits avec un vocabulaire et une introduction sur le "toḅharien"*, Paris, 1933.

Lüders, H., *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Dramen. Königlich Preussische Turfan Expeditionen. Kleinere Sanskrit Texte. Heft 1*, Leipzig, 1911.

———, *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta (Kleinere Sanskrit Texte, Heft 2*, Leipzig, 1926).

Matsumoto, Eiichi, *Tonkō-ga no kenkyū. Zuzo-hen, Vol. I Text. Vol. II Plates*, Tokyo.

Pelliot, P., *Les grottes de Touen Houang; Peintures et sculp-*

- tures Bouddhiques des époques des Wei, des T'ang et des Song*, tomes 1-3, Paris, 1920; tomes 4-5, Paris, 1921; tome 6, Paris, 1924.
- Reichelt Hans, *Die Sogdischen Handschriftenreste des Britischen Museums*, in umschrift und mit übersetzung herausgegeben, I Teil, *Die Buddhistischen Texte*, Heidelberg, 1928.
- Sieg, E., and Siegling, W., *Tocharische Sprachreste*, Berlin, 1921.
- , *Tocharische Grammatik*, Göttingen, 1931.
- Stäel Holstein, Baron A. von, *The Kāśyapaparivarta, a Mahāyāna Sūtra of the Ratnakūṭa class edited in the original Sanskrit, in Tibetan and in Chinese*. Shanghai, 1926.
- Stein, Sir Aurel, *Serindia. Detailed report of explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China carried out and described under the orders of H. M. Indian Govt.* Vols. I-III Text; Vol. IV. Plates; Vol. V Charts. London, 1921.
- , *The Thousand Buddhas. Ancient Buddhist paintings from the Cave temples of Tun-huang on the west frontier of China recovered and described by Sir Aurel Stein*, Vol. I Text; Vol. II Plates. London, 1921.
- Takakusu, J. and Watanabe, K., *Taisho Shinsu daizokyo* (Revised edition of Taisho Canon).
- Takakusu, J., *Showa Hobo Somokuroku* (Catalogue of Taisho Tripiṭaka) Tokyo, 1929.
- Thomas, F. W., *A Rāmāyaṇa Story in Tibetan from Chinese Turkestan in Indian Studies in honour of Charles Rockwell Lanman*, pp. 193-212. Harvard Oriental Press, Cambridge, Mass, 1921.
- , *Indianism and its expansion*. Calcutta University Readership Lectures. Calcutta, 1942. [V. Greater India: Central Asia: VI Greater India: Tibet: VIII Greater India: Further India and Malayasia.]
- , *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents concerning Chinese Turkestan* Pt. II.

- Uehara, Y., *Shin-Saiikki* (New record of Western countries). Tokyo, 1937.
- Waldschmidt, E., *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣunī Prātimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins* (Kleinere Sanskrit Texte, Heft III) Leipzig 1926.
- , *Bruchstücke buddhistischer sūtras aus den zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Kanon, I herausgegeben und im zusammenhang mit ihren Parallel-versionen bearbeitet.* (Kleinere Sanskrit Texte, Heft IV), Leipzig. 1932.
- Waley, A., *A Catalogue of Paintings from Tun-huang by Sir Aurel Stein, preserved in the sub-department of Oriental Prints and Drawings in the British Museum and in the Museum of Central Asian Antiquities, Delhi, with preface by L. Binyon.* London, 1931.
- Yabuki, K., *Meisha Youn* ('Echoes of Singing Sands'). Eng. title *Rare and unknown Chinese Ms. remains of Buddhist literature, discovered in Tun-huang, collected by Sir Aurel Stein and preserved in the British Museum.* Tokyo, 1931.
- , *Meisha Youn Kaisetsu* ('Explanatory Text of Echoes of Singing Sands'). Tokyo, 1933.
- [For articles published in *SPAW.*, *BSOS.*, *AKM.*, *IHQ.*, *Bulletin of National Library of Peiping*, *Academia Sinica*, etc, see text].

TIBET

- A Catalogue Index of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bṛāh-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur).* Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University Aided by Saitō gratitude Foundation, 1934.
- A Complete Catalogue of the Tibetan Buddhist Canons (Bṛāh-hgyur and Bstan-hgyur).* Edited by Hakuji Ui, Mametada Suzuki, Yenshō Kanakura and Tokan Tada. Sendai: Tōhoku Imperial University, Aided by Saitō gratitude Foundation, 1934.
- Bacot, J., *Dictionnaire Tibétain-Sanskrit par Tse-ring Ouang*

- Gyal* (Che Rin dBan rGyal). Reproduction Photo-type. Paris, 1930.
- Bell, Sir Charles. *The Religion of Tibet*, Oxford, 1931.
- Bhattacharya, Vidhushekhara, *Nyāyapraveśa Pt. II, Tibetan text edited with Introduction, notes, appendices etc.*, by Pandit Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya, G.O.S. No. XXXIX, Baroda 1927.
- , *The Chatuśśataka of Āryadeva, Sanskrit and Tibetan text with copious extracts from the commentary of Candrakīrti*. Reconstructed and edited by Vidhushekhara Bhattacharya. Part II. (All published). Calcutta, 1931.
- Binyon, Laurence, *L'art asiatique au British Museum. Sculpture et Peinture. Ars Asiatica, VI*, Paris Bruxelles, 1925.
- Getty, Alice, *The Gods of Northern Buddhism, their history, iconography and progressive evolution through the Northern Buddhist countries, with a general introduction on Buddhism*. 2nd ed. London, 1929.
- Hackin, J., *La sculpture indienne et tibétaine au musée Guimet*, Paris, 1931.
- Lalou, Marcelle, *Catalogue du fonds tibétain de la Bibliothèque Nationale*. Paris, 1931.
- Obermiller, E., *Indices Verborum Sanskrit-Tibetan and Tibetan-Sanskrit to the Nyāyavindu of Dharmakīrti and the Nāyavinduṭīkā of Dharmottara* compiled by E. Obermiller with a preface by Th. Stcherbatsky from the edition of the Sanskrit and Tibetan texts by Th. Stcherbatsky. I *Sanskrit-Tibetan Index*. Bib. Buddhica XXIV, 1927. II. *Tibetan-Sanskrit Index*. Bib. Buddhica XXV, 1928.
- , *History of Buddhism (chos-hbying) by Bu-ston, Part I, The Jewelry of Scripture*, Heidelberg 1931, *Part II, The History of Buddhism in India and Tibet*, Heidelberg, 1932.
- Pascal, Claude, *Musée Louis Finot. La collection tibétaine*. Hanoi 1935.

Sakurabe, B., *A Comparative Analytical Catalogue of the Kanjur division of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka* edited in Peking during the K'ang hsi era and at present kept in the library of the Otani Daigaku, in which the contents of each sūtra are collated with their corresponding parts in existing Sanskrit, Pāli and Chinese texts and in which page references to the Narthang and Derge editions of the Tripiṭaka are also entered. Kyoto, Otani Daigaku Library Pt. I, 1930; Pt. II, 1931; Pt. III, 1932.

Sanskrit Texts from Tibet, published by the Bihar and Orissa Research Society. I. *Vārttikālaṃkāra* of Prajñākara-gupta, ed. Rahula Sankrityayana. II. *Vādanyāya* of Āchārya Dharmakīrti with the commentary of Āchārya Śāntarakṣita. ed. Rahula Sankrityayana. III. *Adhyardhaśataka* of Mātṛceta, ed. K. P. Jayaswal and Rahula Sankrityayana. IV. *Vigrahavyāvartanī* of Āchārya Nāgārjuna with the author's own commentary, ed. K. P. Jayaswal and Rahula Sankrityayana. V. *Pramāṇavārttika* of Āchārya Dharmakīrti, ed. Rahula Sankrityayana.

Stcherbatsky. Th., *Tibetan Text of Abhidharmaśāstra, Kārikās and Bhāṣyas*, Part I ed. Th. Stcherbatsky. Bib. Buddhica, No. XX, 1907.

———, and Obermiller, E., *Abhisamayālaṃkāra Prajñāpāramitā-upadeśa-śāstra*, ed. Th. Stcherbatsky and E. Obermiller. Bib. Buddhica XXIII, Leningrad, 1929.

Tucci, Guiseppe, *The Nyāyamukha of Dignāga, the oldest Buddhist text on Logic, after Chinese and Tibetan materials*. Quinzième cahier des *Materialien* de Max Walleser, 1930.

———, *Commentaries on the Prajñāpāramitās*, Vol. I. *The Abhisamayālaṃkāraśloka of Haribhadra and the Aṣṭasāhasrikā-prajñāpāramitā* edited with Introduction and Indices by Guiseppe Tucci. G.O.S. No. XLIX, 1932.

- ., *Indo-Tibetica*, I “mc’od rten” e “ts’a ts’a” nel Tibet indiano ed occidentale. Contributo allo studio dell’arte religiosa tibetana e del suo significato. Reale Accademia d’Italia, Studi e Documenti. Roma, Reale Accademia d’Italia, 1932.
- ., *Indo-Tibetica*, II Rin c’en bzan po e la rinacista del Buddhismo nel Tibet intorno al mille..... Reale Accademia d’Italia, 1933.
- ., *Indo-Tibetica* III. I Templi del Tibet Occidentale e il loro simbolismo Artistico. Partie I: Spiti e Kunavar ... Roma, 1935. Partie II. Tsaparang, Roma, 1936.
- ., *Hitherto unknown Tibet, Painting recalling the Art of Ajanta*. Illustrated London News, Jan. 18, 1936.
- ., *Santi e Brigandi nel Tibet ignoto*. (Diario della spedizione nel Tibet occidentale, 1935). Milano, 1937.
- ., and Ghersi, E.: *Cronaca della Missione scientifica Tucci nel Tibet Occidentale* (1933). Roma, 1934.
- Weller, Friederich, *Das Leben des Buddha von Ásvaghosa. Tibetisch und Deutsch*, I. Teil, Leipzig, 1926, II Teil, Leipzig, 1928 (Veröffentlichungen des Forschungsinstituts für Vergleichende Religionsgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig. Hg. von Prof. Dr. Hans Haas, Zweite Reihe, Heft 8).
- Wogihara, U., . *Abhisamayālaṃkāra-loka Prajñāpāramitā-vyākhyā, the work of Haribhadra, together with the text commented on*. Tokyo, 1932.
- Yamaguchi, Susumu, *Examen de l’object de la connaissance (Ālambanaparīkṣā). Textes tibétain et chinois et traduction des stances et du commentaire*. J.A., Jan.,-Mars., 1929..

MONGOLIA AND MANCHURIA

- Haenish, Erich, *Altan Gerel: Die West-Mongolisch Fassung des goldglanzsūtra nach einer Handschrift der Kgl. Bibliothek in Kopenhagen*, 1929. Verlag der Asia Major, Leipzig.

Radlov, V. V. and Malov, S. E., *Suvarṇaprabhāsa* (Uiguric text). Parts I-VIII, Bib. Buddhica XVII. Leningrad, 1915-17.

Vladimircov, B. Y., *Bodhicaryāvatāra de Śāntideva, traduction mongole de Chos-Kyi'od-zer. I Texte* Bibliotheca Buddhica XXVIII. Leningrad, 1929.

BURMA

Duroiselle, Charles, *A List of Inscriptions found in Burma. Part I. The List of Inscriptions arranged in order of their dates*, Rangoon, 1921.

———, *The Ananda Temple of Pagan. (Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India No. 56)*. Delhi, 1937.

Harvey, G. E., *History of Burma from the earliest times to the 10th March 1824, the beginning of the English conquest*. London, 1925.

Luce, G. H., and Tin, Pe Maung, *Inscriptions of Burma. University of Burma Oriental Series Publications. Portfolio I. 493-599 B.E. (A.D. 1131-1237)*, 109 plates, Oxford, 1933. *Portfolio II. Down to 630 B.E. (1268 A.D.)*, 115 plates. *Portfolio III, 630-662 B.E. (1268-1300 A.D.)*, 121 plates, London, 1939.

Ray, Nihar-ranjan, *Brahmanical gods in Burma*, Calcutta, 1932.

———, *Sanskrit Buddhism in Burma*, Calcutta, 1935.

[For papers published in the *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, *Epigraphia Birmanica*, *Epigraphia Indica*, *Annual Reports of the Archaeological Survey of India*, *J.G.I.S.*, *J.I.S.O.A.*, *J.A.*, *J.R.A.S.*, etc., see text].

SIAM

Cœdès, George, *Recueil des Inscriptions du Siam. Première partie*, Bangkok, 1924. *Deuxième partie*, Bangkok, 1929.

———, *Les Collections Archéologiques du Musée National de Bangkok*, *Ars Asiatica*, XII, Paris et Bruxelles, 1928.

Le May, Reginald, *The Coinage of Siam*, Bangkok, 1932.

———., *Buddhist Art in Siam, a concise history with a foreword by Sir John Marshall*. With an index, two maps and eighty pages of illustrations in collotype. Cambridge, 1938.

Quaritch-Wales, H. G., *Siamese State Ceremonies, their history and function*, London, 1931.

Salmony, A., *Sculpture in Siam*, London, 1925.

———., *La Sculpture au Siam*, Paris et Bruxelles, 1925.

———., *Die Plastik in Siam*, Hellerau, 1926.

Wood, W. A. R., *A History of Siam from the earliest times to the year A.D. 1781*, London, 1926.

[See text for articles published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *J.A.*, *J.S.S.*, *R.A.A.*, *J.A.L.*, *A.B.I.A.*, *Burlington Magazine*, etc.]

CAMBODIA

Aymonier, E., *Histoire de l'ancien Cambodge*, Strassbourg, 1920.

Cahiers de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient, Nos. 1-26, Hanoi, 1934-41.

Chatterji, Bijan Raj, *Indian Cultural Influences in Cambodia*, Calcutta, 1928.

Coedès, George & Parmentier, H., *Listes générales des inscriptions et des monuments du Champa et du Cambodge*. *Inscriptions* par George Coedès. *Monuments* par Henri Parmentier, Hanoi, 1923.

Coedès, George, *Bronzes Khmer*, *Ars Asiatica* V, Paris, 1923.

———., *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, éditées et traduites par George Coedès, Vol. I. avec 1 volume de planches formant le tome VI. des *Inscriptions du Cambodge* publiées sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Hanoi, 1937.

Dupont, Pierre, *Musée Guimet. Catalogue des collections indo-chinoises précédé d'études* par Ph. Stern, J. Auboyer, G. de Coral-Rémusat et P. Dupont, Paris, 1934.

Etudes asiatiques publiées à l'occasion du 25^e anniversaire de l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient, 2 vols. Paris, 1927.

Finot, L., Parmentier, H., et Goloubew, V., *Le temple d'Isvarapura (Bantay Srēi). Le Monument, étude architecturale* par Henri Parmentier; *Les Images* par Victor Goloubew; *Les Inscriptions et l'histoire* par Louis Finot. *Mémoires Archéologiques publiés par l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient*, Tome I, Paris, 1926.

Finot, L., Goloubew, V. et Coédès, G., *Le temple d'Angkor Vat. Première partie: L'Architecture du Monument*, I. *Préface* de Louis Finot, planches I à 72; II *Planches* 73 à 150. Paris et Bruxelles 1929. *Deuxième partie: La Sculpture Ornementale du temple. I. Introduction* par V. Goloubew, planches 151 à 218. II. *Planches* 219 à 286. Paris et Bruxelles, 1930. *Troisième partie: La galerie des bas-reliefs, I. Introduction* par G. Coédès, planches 287 à 350, Pavillons d'angle; II. *Planches* 351 à 496. III. *Planches* 497 à 608. Paris et Bruxelles 1932 (*Mémoires Archéologiques publiés par l'Ecole Française d'Extrême Orient*, tome II).

Groslier, G., *Recherches sur les Cambodgiens*, Paris, 1921.

———., *La Sculpture Khmère ancienne*, Paris, 1925.

———., *Arts et archéologie Khmers. Revue des Recherches sur les Arts, les Monuments, et l'Ethnographie du Cambodge depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*. Tomes I-II. Paris, 1921-26.

———., *Les Collections Khmers du Musée Albert Sarraut à Phnom-Penh*. Paris-Bruxelles, 1931.

Inscriptions du Cambodge. Publiées sous les auspices de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Tomes I-V, Paris 1926-31. ...

Marchal, Henri, *Musée Louis Finot. La Collection Khmère*. Hanoi, 1939.

———., *Guide archéologique aux temple d'Angkor*.

Angkor Vat, Angkor Thom et les monuments du Petit et du Grand Circuit. Paris et Bruxelles, 1928. (New English edition of the above by H. Marchal. Saigon, 1933).

Parmentier, Henri, *L'art Khmer primitif.* I. Texte, index, table analytique, lexique des noms étrangers. II. 4 cartes géographiques, 96 planches, 128 gravures et une table générale des planches (vols. XXI et XXII des Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient, Paris, 1927).

———, *L'art Khmer Classique.* Monuments du Quadrant Nord-Est, Tome I. Texte, Tome II. Planches. Paris, 1939.

Stern, Philippe, *Le Bayon d'Angkor et l'évolution de l'art Khmer. Étude et discussion de la chronologie des monuments Khmers,* Paris, 1927.

[See text for articles, published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *J.A.*, *I.A.L.*, *R.A.A.*, *J.G.I.S.*, *Études d'Orientalisme Linossier* etc.

CHAMPA

Majumdar, R. C., *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East,* Vol. I. *Champā.* Greater India Society's publication, no. I, Lahore, 1927.

Maspero, Georges, *Le Royaume de Champa,* Paris et Bruxelles, 1928.

Parmentier, H., *Inventaire archéologique de l'Indo-Chine.* II. *Monuments Chams de l'Annam.* Texte, tomes I-II. Planches, 2 albums. 1918-19.

———, *Les sculptures Chams au Musée de Tourane.* *Ars Asiatica,* Paris, 1922.

[For papers published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *A.B.I.A.*, *J.G.I.S.*, etc. see text.].

JAVA

Bibliotheca Javanica, No. 2. *Tantri Kāmandaka een oud-Javaansche Pañtjatantra-bewerking, in tekst en verta-*

- ling, uitgegeven door Dr. C. Hooykaas, 1931; No. 3. *Smaradahana, oud-Javaansche tekst met vertaling*, uitgegeven door R. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjaraka, 1931; No. 4. *Het oud-Javaansche Nitiçāstra*, uitgegeven door R. Ng. Dr. Poerbatjaraka, 1933; No. 5. *Het oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, uitgegeven en van aantekeningen voorzien door Dr. J. Gonda 1932; No. 6. *Het oud-Javaansche Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa*, vertaald door Dr. J. Gonda 1933; No. 7A. *Aantekeningen bij het oud-Javaansche Bhīṣma-parwa* door Dr. J. Gonda, 1937.
- Bosch, F. W. K., *De Bhadracari op den hoofdmuur der vierde gaanding van den Baraboedoer*. B. K. I. 1938.
- Dupont, Pierre, *Musée Guimet. Catalogue des Collections indo-chinoises* par Pierre Dupont. Précédé d'études par Philippe Stern, Jeannie Auboyer, G. de Coral-Rémusat, Pierre Dupont Paris, 1934.
- Feestbundel uitgegeven door Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en wetenschappen bij gelegenheid van zijn 150—Jarig bestaan 1778-1928. Weltevreden, Vol. I. 1929.*
- Getty, Alice, Ganesa. *A monography on the elephant-faced god. With an Introduction by Alfred Foucher*. Oxford at the Clarendon Press, 1936.
- Gonda, J., *Agastyaparwa*, uitgegeven, gecommenteerd en vertaald 1933, 1935, 1936.
- Goris, R., *Bijdrage tot de Kennis der oud-Javaansche en Balineesche Theologie*, Leyden, 1926.
- Kats, J., *Het Rāmāyaṇa op Javaansche Tempel-Reliefs (The Rāmāyaṇa as sculptured in reliefs in Javanese temples)*. Batavia-Leiden, 1925.
- Krom, N. J., *Inleiding tot de Hindoe-Javaansche Kunst*, Tweede Herziene druk. I-II, text. III, plates. The Hague, 1923.
- , *L'art Javanais dans les Musées de Hollande et de Java, Ars Asiatica VIII*. Paris et Bruxelles 1926.

- ., *De levensgeschiedenis van den Buddha op Borobudur*. The Hague, 1926.
- ., *The Life of Buddha on the Stūpa of Barabudur according to the Lalitavistara text*. The Hague, 1926.
- ., *Borobudur, Archaeological Description*, 2 vols. The Hague, 1927.
- ., *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*, 2nd ed. The Hague, 1931.
- Krom, N. J., & Erp, T. van, *Beschrijving van Barabudur*, Pt. I. N. J. Krom, *Archaeologisch Beschrijving*, Part II. T. van Erp, *Bouwkundige-Beschrijving*, The Hague, 1920, 1932.
- Lelyveld, T. B. van, *De Javaansche danskunst*. Amsterdam, 1931.
- ., *Le danse dans le théâtre javanais*. Paris, 1931.
- Lévi, Sylvain, *Recherches à Java et à Bali*, Leyden, 1929.
- ., *Mahākarmavibhaṅga (Le grande classification des actes) et Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa (discussion sur le Mahākarmavibhaṅga). Textes Sanscrits rapportés du Nepal, édités et traduits avec le textes parallèles en Sanscrit, en Pali, en tibétaine, en chinois, et en Koutchéen; ouvrage illustré de quatre planches: Le Karmavibhaṅga sur les bas-reliefs de Borobudur à Java*. Paris, 1932.
- Majumdar, R. C., *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*. Vol. II. *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Part I. *Political History*, Dacca, 1937. Part II. *Cultural History*, Calcutta, 1938.
- Mythologie asiatique illustrée. Redigée sous le direction de M. P.-L., Couchoud, par Mm. Cl. Huart, J. Hackin, Mlle. R. Linossier, Mme. de Wilman-Grabowska, Mm. H. Marchal, H. Maspero, S. Elisséev*. Paris, 1928. [Eng. tr. of the above by F. M. Atkinson, London. The above work deals also with the mythology of Tibet, Central Asia, Cambodia and Champa].
- Nag, Kalidas, *India and the Pacific World*, Calcutta, 1941.

- Poerbatjaraka, L., *Agastya in den Archipel*, Leyden, 1926.
- Prijoetomo, M., *Nawaruci, Inleiding, middel-Javaansche Proza-tekst vertaling door Prijoetomo*. Batavia, 1934.
- Sarkar, Himansu Bhusan, *Indian Influences on the literature of Java and Bali*. Calcutta, 1934.
- Stutterheim, W. F., *Rama-Legenden und Rama-Reliefs in Indonesien*. Bands I-II. München, 1925.
- Wilsen, F. C., *Die Buddha legende auf den Flachreliefs der ersten Galerie des Stūpa von Boro-Budur (Java)*. Verkleinerte wiedergabe der Umrisszeichnungen von F. C. Wilsen. Leipzig, 1937.
- Wulff, *Den oudjavanske wirataparwa og dens Sanskrit original*. 1917.
- [See text for articles published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *B.K.I.*, *T.B.G.*, *Djawa*, *J.G.I.S.*, etc. as well as for references in the successive issues of *Oudheidkundig Verslag* and the *Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen Jaarboek*].

BALI

- Callenfels, P. V. van Stein, *Epigraphia Balica, I*. Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen, Vol. LXVI, Part 3. Batavia, 1926.
- Krom, N. J., *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*. 1931.
- Lévi, Sylvain, *Sanskrit texts from Bali*, G.O.S. No. LXVI. 1933.
- Majumdar, R. C., *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Parts I & II.
- Moojen, P. A. J., *Kunst op Bali inleidende studie tot de bouwkunst*. The Hague, 1926.
- Stutterheim, W. F., *Oudheden van Bali, I*. Heft. *Oude rijk van Pedjeng*. Text. Singaradja, Bali. Kirtya Liefcrinck van der Tuuk, 1929.

BORNEO AND CELEBES

Majumdar, R. C., *Suvarṇadvīpa*.

Midden-Oost Borneo Expeditie, 1925.

[For articles published in *B.K.I.*, *T.B.G.*, *J.A.S.B.*, *J.G.I.S.*, etc., see text].

SUMATRA

Krom, N. J., *De Soematraansche periode in de Javaansche Geschiedenis*. Leyden, 1919.

———, *Hindoe-Javaansche Geschiedenis*. [Cited above].

Majumdar, R. C., *Suvarṇadvīpa*. [Cited above].

Schnitger, F. M., *Oudheidkundige Vondsten in Padang Lawas*, Amsterdam, 1936.

———, *Hindoe-Oudheden aan de Batang Hari*, Leiden, 1936.

———, *The Archaeology of Hindoo Sumatra*. Leyden, 1937.

Stutterheim, W. F., *A Javanese period in Sumatran History*. Surakarta, 1929.

[For articles published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *B.K.I.*, *O.V.*, *J.A.*, *J.G.I.S.*, etc. see text].

MALAY

Evans, Ivor K. N., *Papers on the Ethnology and Archaeology of the Malay Peninsula*. Cambridge, 1927.

Majumdar, R. C., *Suvarṇadvīpa*.

Quaritch-Wales, H. G., *Archaeological Researches on Ancient Indian colonization*. 1940.

[For articles published in *B.E.F.E.O.*, *T.B.G.*, *J.R.A.S.M.B.*, *J.A.S.B.*, *J.G.I.S.*, *J.A.*, etc. see text].

CEYLON

Codrington, H. W., *Ceylon Coins & Currency*, Colombo, 1924.

———, *A Short History of Ceylon*, London, 1926.

- ., *Ancient Land Tenure and Revenue in Ceylon*.
Colombo, 1938.
- Coomaraswamy, A. K., *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, London, 1927.
- ., *Bronzes from Ceylon, chiefly in the Colombo Museum* (Memoirs of the Colombo Museum).
- Mendis, G. C., *The Early History of Ceylon*, 4th ed.,
Calcutta, 1940.
- Smith, V. A., *A History of Fine Art in India and Ceylon*,
2nd ed., Oxford, 1930.
- [For articles published in *Ep. Zeylanica*, *Ceylon Journal of Science Sec. G. Archaeology, ethnology etc.*,
Ann. Rep. of the Arch. Survey of Ceylon. *A.B.I.A.*,
J.G.I.S., etc. see text].

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum: By C. Sivaramamurti, M.A., (Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum), Madras 1942. pp. xviii+376 and 55 Plates. Government Press, Madras, Rs. 14/8.*

Amarāvati, situated on the south bank of the Krishna river in the Guntur district of the Madras Presidency, was one of the great cities of India in the first two centuries before Christ and the centuries immediately following. Its glory was the magnificent Buddhist *stūpa* with a drum adorned with two tiers of casing slabs in bluish marble, the whole structure being enclosed by an exquisitely carved railing in the same material which was nearly six hundred feet in circumference and thirteen or fourteen feet in height. 'It has been estimated that the railing alone provided a superficial area of 17,000 square feet covered with delicate reliefs, while the *stūpa* itself, all the lower part of which was cased in carved stone, had a diameter of 162 feet'. (A. K. Coomaraswamy, *History of Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 70). Revered as the principal seat of one of the ancient Buddhist schools (the *caitya*śas of the Mahāsaṅghika sect), the *stūpa* received successive additions at the hands of pious devotees for a period of four or five centuries (2nd century B.C. to c. 250 A.D.). In later times it shared in the general neglect of Buddhist monuments which was the index of the decay of the religion of the Buddha in its homeland. Re-discovered by Col. Colin Mackenzie in 1797, it has undergone more or less unsystematic excavations for nearly a century, presenting before the year 1880, in the forceful language of M. Foucher (*L' Art Gréco-Bouddhique du Gandhāra*, tome II, p. 613), 'a déplorable odyssée des débris de ce merveilleux édifice'. Out of the group of Amarāvati marbles which it was possible to save from destruction, an important collection found its way, like the famous Elgin marbles of the Parthenon, into the

* A brief extract from this review was published by the present writer in the *Calcutta Statesman* in its issue of December 13, 1942.

British Museum in London. Another valuable collection was deposited in the Madras Museum, while a few sculptures were sent to the Indian Museum in Calcutta.

To Dr. James Burgess of the Archaeological Survey of India, who was entrusted with the scientific excavation of the monument in 1881, we owe the first important monograph on the subject. It was published in 1887 under the title *The Buddhist Stūpas of Amaravati and Jaggayyapeta*. Since then considerable additions have been made to our knowledge of the famous *stūpa* by the discovery of fresh sculptures and revised interpretations of older ones as well as the decipherment of the inscriptions. In the present well-written monograph the author has utilised the researches of previous scholars (including the valuable notes of Mr. T. N. Ramachandran) as well as his own intensive studies to produce an admirably comprehensive and up-to-date description of the sculptures of the Madras Museum collection. While it is much to be regretted that he had no opportunities of completing his study by utilising the British Museum or even the Calcutta Museum collections, we are thankful to him for providing us with something more than a mere descriptive catalogue of the sculptures and inventory of the inscriptions. For he has enriched his account within his compass with a short, but valuable, historical introduction, with an excellent survey of the art, iconography and symbolism of the monument, and last but not least, with a vivid and complete picture of the culture and civilisation of the period accompanied with illustrative drawings of the sculptures and copious references from Brahmanical and Buddhist literature. A good bibliography, five valuable appendices (including indices of personal and geographical names and a glossary of words occurring in the inscriptions), a general index and fifty-five plates with short explanatory notes complete this fine monograph.

We propose to make a few remarks. Following the authority of Burgess, the author identifies (p.3) Hiuen Tsang's capital city of Tho-na-kie-tse-kia (Read *T'e-na-ka-che-ka*

with Watters) with Amarāvati, forgetting Watters' criticism (*On Yuan Chwang*, Vol. II, p. 218) to the effect that Hiuen Tsang is completely silent about the existence of the *stūpa* in that area. The author's further suggestion (p.4) that the original *stūpa* of Amarāvati was built by Aśoka rests on the flimsiest grounds, while it is significant that not even the tradition of such a construction was known to the industrious Hiuen Tsang at the time of his visit in the 7th century.

The writer justifies (p. 16ff.) his chronological division of the Amarāvati sculptures into four periods, viz. c. 200-100 B.C., c. 100 A.D., c. 150 A.D. and c. 200-250 A.D., which is based on the style of the sculptures and palaeography of the inscriptions, by an elaborate comparison of *motifs* and technique from the earliest to the latest times. In this connection we are presented with a useful comparative "table of early Indian sculptural periods" tracing the minute changes in dress and ornament, in pose and motifs, in human and other forms, for nearly a millennium, from the sculpture of Bhārhut, Ajaṇṭā Cave X, Amarāvati I and Sāñchī (2nd cent. B.C.) to those of the Pallava monuments (7th-8th centuries A. D.) It must, however, be remembered that the art of Sāñchī itself passed through a long course of development and decay. In the sculptures of the Second and Third *stūpas* (excepting the gateway and the ground balustrade of the latter) as well as the ground balustrade and stone casing of the Great *Stūpa* (2nd cent. B.C.) the early indigenous school retains much of its primitive character. But the school reaches its climax in the reliefs of the four gateways of the Great *Stūpa* and the single gateway of the Third *stūpa* (c. 50 B.C.). Further developments may be traced in the detached images of the 4th and 5th centuries A.D. as well as those of the 6th and 7th centuries. The group of structures on the eastern terrace of the Sāñchī Hill belonging to the late mediaeval period mark the last stage in the development of the local art. (On the above, see Sir John Marshall, *A Guide to Sanchi*, pp. 11-25). Evidently the author, in drawing up his comparative table, has ignored all but the first phase of the Sāñchī art.

Equally regrettable is the author's complete omission to illustrate the interesting changes to which he draws attention, with appropriate drawings.

In connecting (p. 44) 'the art of such distant places as Amarāvati and Jaggayyapeta, Bharhut and Sanchi, Ajanta and Bagh and beyond the seas at Borabudur' (*sic*!), by 'common heredity' with 'the great Imperial art of the Mauryas' the author ignores the division of Maurya art into the official or court art of Aśoka's reign, which according to most authorities was more or less of an exotic character, and the art of the Early Indian School which was represented at Bharhut and Sāñchi. It is also to be regretted that the author has failed to consider the views of M. Foucher (*op. cit.*, pp. 613-618) regarding the influence of the Gandhāra School upon the later art of Amarāvati. The section on iconography and symbolism (a more appropriate title would have been 'representations of Buddha, of demi-gods and of real and mythical animals') of the monument is good so far as it goes. But the author has unfortunately failed to refer to the valuable contributions made on the subject by Foucher (*op. cit.*) and Vogel, (*Gangā et Yamunā dans l' iconographie Brahmanique, Études Asiatiques*, 1925 and *Le Maṅkara dans la sculpture de l'Inde, Revue des Arts Asiatiques*, Paris 1930). If he had referred to Vogel's monograph last-named, he would have found (*op. cit.*, p. 94) the ancestry of the *Maṅkara-motif* to be traced beyond Bharhut and Amarāvati to the crocodile figures on the façade of the Lomasa Rishi Cave at the Barabar Hills near Gaya.

The author's description of the various aspects of Indian life in the light of the Amarāvati sculptures of the third period which is illustrated with appropriate drawings and explained in the light of literary references is accurate and comprehensive. But he might have referred to the important paper of Dr. Moti Chandra, *The History of Indian costume from the first century A.D. to the beginning of the fourth century* (JISOA, 1940).

We have noticed a few misprints which may be corrected

in a future edition. Such are Rae, Bacchofer (p. xvii), Barnet Kempers (pp. xvii, 153, 310), Tournier (p. 4), Simukha (p. 9), Les sculpture (p. 32), and Khabho (p. 272). For *loc. cit.* (pp. 3, 6, 14 etc.) read *op. cit.* The rendering of Sūnyavāda (p. 16) as Nihilism should be discarded in favour of the more accurate term 'Doctrine of Absolute Truth'. The reference (p. 272) to Guṇaḍhya's *Bṛhat-kathā* as a poem is a slip. We do not know on what grounds Kalidāsa is assigned to the Śuṅga period (p. 55). The want of diacritical marks throughout the work is much to be regretted. It is difficult to understand why the author should refer (p. 182 etc.) to late Burmese Buddhist legends narrated by Spence Hardy as his authorities for identification of the Amarāvati sculptures. It is also curious to find that for his account (p. 16) of incipient schisms in Buddha's life-time and for his interpretations of sculptures of c. 150 A.D. he can quote no earlier authorities than the *Dhammapada* commentary (pp. 187, 193, 195, 198, 199, 200, 202, 214 and 228). The same criticism applies to his quotation of Dhammapāla's commentray on the *Therīgāthā* (p. 192) and of the *Avadāna-kalpalatā* (p. 215) for the interpretation of other sculptures of the same period.

U. N. GHOSHAL

Palni The Sacred Hill of Muruga: By J. M. Somasundaram. Published by the Sri Dandayuthapani Swami Devasthanam, Palni. Madras, 1941. 48 pp. Price -/12/-.

In this monograph Mr. J. M. Somasundaram, whose earlier work on *The Great Temple of Tanjore* was reviewed by us in a former issue of this Journal, attempts a short description of the great shrine of Dandayuthapani and attached temples on and near the sacred hill of the child-god Muruga at Palni. The author, who holds the high post of executive officer of the Sri Dandayuthapani Devasthanam, has succeeded in giving within a short compass much valuable information about the main shrine and its adjuncts. We learn from him the topography, history and communication of the site, the early history of the main shrine,

the principal festivals, the literary works connected therewith and so forth. It is good to learn that under the enlightened management of the trustees in recent years a Śaiva-Siddhānta Sabhā, a Veda-Śivāgama Patasala, a library and a reading-room have been founded on the site. At the end of the work the author gives in the form of Appendices a list of twenty-six constituent temples of the Devasthanam and a list of landed properties attached thereto as well as a chronological list of trustees from 1863 onwards together with the improvements effected in their time. Two other Appendices contain a select bibliography (in the original Tamil) of the literature dealing with the shrine and the English translation of an ancient hymn in honour of the god Muruga composed according to the orthodox tradition (which the author accepts unquestioningly) by Nakkirar, a member of the third Tamil academy who belonged to about the first century A.D. Nine plates (including a ground-plan of the main shrine) and twenty-six illustrations added to the usefulness of this work.

We have noticed a few printing mistakes which may be corrected in a later edition. We may further observe that the author would have done well in giving his copious Tamil extracts in an English translation for the benefit of non-Tamilian readers. For the same purpose it would have been useful to append a glossary of technical terms.

U. N. GHOSHAL

The Early Muslim Expansion in South India: By N. Venkataramanyya, M.A., Ph.D., Reader in Indian History and Archaeology, University of Madras. Madras University Historical Series, No. 17. Published by the University of Madras, 1942. 216 pp. Price, Rs. 6/8.

This is another of those valuable publications on South Indian History and Culture which we owe to the Madras School of historians working under the competent guidance of Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. The aim of this monograph, to quote the words of the author's Preface, is 'the investigation

of the circumstances under which the great Hindu empire of Vijayanagara came to be established'. For this purpose he begins with a chapter describing the condition of the four Hindu kingdoms—those of the Sēūṇas (ordinarily known as Yādavas), the Kākatiyas, the Hoysalas and the Pāṇḍyas—on the eve of the Muslim invasions. In the four following chapters he describes the successive waves of Muslim invasions under the Khaljis and the Tughlaqs, ending in the complete subjugation of the four kingdoms by the Delhi Sultanate. The sixth chapter briefly sketches the administration of the new rulers with its characteristic weaknesses. The dramatic story of the emancipation of the land from the yoke of Delhi forms the subject-matter of the seventh chapter. The concluding chapter deals briefly with the new Hindu kingdoms that arose on the ruins of of the Muslim empire in the South.

In tracing the eventful history of the country on the lines sketched above, the author who has already a number of important works on South Indian history to his credit, has undoubtedly attained great success. His use of sources is very nearly exhaustive, as he lays under contribution not only Sanskrit and Tamil literary works and South Indian inscriptions, but also the important Persian histories and Portuguese notices. We only wish he had utilised the evidence of the coins of the Sultans of Madura. The author shows sound judgment in sifting the discrepant and often contradictory evidence of his authorities on various matters of detail. His style is clear and forceful. His explanation of historical movements is suggestive and thoughtful, if not always convincing.

We shall make a few remarks. Speaking of the Hindu re-action following the successive inroads of Islam, the author says (p. 146):—'The Hindus of the North, though they clung to their ancient faith ever so tenaciously, offered little or no resistance to their oppressors. They meekly submitted to all this ill-treatment and betrayed a strange incapacity to organise themselves to defend their spiritual

freedom (*sic*). When, however, the Muhammadans extended their field of activities and attempted to impose their yoke upon the Hindus of the Deccan, they found that the task was not easy of accomplishment... Their success was evanescent and their authority was overthrown as quickly as it was established.' This strange verdict which is at variance with the authors' usual sense of fairness, ignores the prolonged and successful stand made by the Guhilas and other dynasties of Rajputana, the Ahom kings of Assam and the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kalinga, for their independence. In the same context (pp. 165-66) the author accounts for the impermanent character of Muslim rule in South India by referring to certain characteristics of the Śaivas of that region, 'which, while distinguishing them from the other Hindus, reveal a strange affinity to the followers of Islam.' These features, according to the author, consisted in their strict monotheism, their faith in themselves being the chosen of god, their indifference to distinctions of birth and wealth within their own ranks and their intolerance towards their rival creeds. Elsewhere (pp. 11-12), however, the author mentions amongst the causes of the political and social degradation of the Hindus on the eve of the Muslim invasion, the bitter struggle for supremacy between Śaivism (specially Vira-Śaivism) and Vaiṣṇavism. We are nowhere told whether and if so how, 'the two dominant creeds of Hinduism' were reconciled to each other during the interval, so as to ensure the common solidarity of the people. Nor again does it appear why the strong points of South Indian Śaivism failed to ensure the immunity of the Hindu Kingdoms in the earlier period.

We cannot conclude without stating that the present work makes a very important and useful contribution to the history of the period with which it deals. Its value would have been enhanced by the addition of maps, genealogical tables and a classified bibliography of sources together with their critical notices.

U. N. GHOSHAL

EDITORIAL NOTES

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the annual donation of Rupees one hundred only for the current year from Dr. Narendra Nath Law, one of the members of its Managing Committee.

* * * * *

On behalf of the University of Ceylon the University Librarian has written (letter dated the 29th April 1943) to the Honorary Secretary, Greater India Society, requesting that the newly started *University of Ceylon Review* be placed on the Exchange List of the Society's journal. The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society has gladly acceded to the request.

* * * * *

The following letter was received by the Honorary Secretary, Greater India Society on 28.7.43

'The Library of Congress, Washington

March 30, 1943

Honorary Secretary, Greater India Society,

35, Badur Bagan Row, Calcutta, India.

Dear Sir,

Some years ago we received a single copy of the Journal of the Greater India Society. We very much desire to secure a complete set of this important Journal.....We also wish to receive the Journal currently and in the future. Would you be willing to consider sending it on an exchange basis?

Very sincerely yours

Sd. Horace I. Poleman

Chief, Indic Section.'

The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society has great pleasure in placing the Congress Library, Washington, on the exchange list of its Journal. It also agreed to send a complete set of the back numbers of the Journal at a concession rate.

* * * * *

The Greater India Society mourns, in common with other Oriental Societies of India and outside, the sad and

sudden death in January 1943 of Dr. V. S. Sukthankar, late general editor of the now well-known critical edition of the *Mahābhārata*. The profound scholarship displayed by the late lamented scholar in his edition of the successive *parvans* of India's greatest Epic rightly earned for him world-wide fame. The Greater India Society has particular reason to honour his memory as he was the first of his countrymen to utilise the Old-Javanese versions of the *Mahābhārata* for his own critical editions.

* * * *

Dr. R. N. Dandekar, Honorary Secretary of the Bhandarkar Research Institute has announced to us the appointment of Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M.A., Ph.D., as general editor of the critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* with effect from the first April 1943. Dr. Belvalkar has much experience in the work of textual criticism, while he has already prepared a critical edition of the *Bhīṣmaparvan*, which is expected to be shortly published. It is to be noted that the great work of bringing out a complete critical edition of the *Mahābhārata* which was left unfinished by Dr. V. S. Sukthankar will be fittingly brought to its close by his successor.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals etc.

Kuppuswami Sastri Commemoration Volume, II.

Babylonia and India by A. Berriedale Keith [Criticism of paper by F. Albright and P. E. Dumont on the parallel between India and Babylonia in *JAOS*. Vol. 54. "There is a vital difference in purpose and character between the Vedic horse-sacrifice and the Babylonian." "The new evidence does not help us in any way to strengthen the case for deducing the Indian *nakṣatras* from Babylonian sources."]

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. X. Pt. 4.

Hvatanica by H. W. Bailey [Text and translation of thirteen Khotanese extracts illustrating the religion of Khotan, together with a Lexical Commentary, a Note on Theology and Legend and an Appendix].

Recherches sur l'etymologie des deux dialects tokhariens. Par A. J. van Windekens [In continuation of the author's publication *De Indo-Europeesche bestanddeelen in de Tocharische declinatie*, Louvain 1940, discusses the etymology of fourteen selected words].

ADDITIONS TO OUR LIBRARY

The Greater India Society begs to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following periodicals and books since the last notice in *JGIS.*, Vol. IX, No. 1.

Periodicals

- Annual Report of the Varendra Research Museum, 1939-40.
Adyar Library Bulletin, vol. VI, Pts. 2-4 ; vol. VII, Pts. 1-2.
Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XXIV, Pts. 1-2.
Bhāratiya Vidyā Patrikā, vol. I, Pts. 5 & 6. Bombay 1943.
Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, vol. III, Nos. 2-4 ; vol. IV, Nos. 1-2.
Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, vol. X, Pt. 4.
Indian Culture, vol. VIII, No. 1.
Indian Historical Quarterly, vol. XVII, No. 4, vol. XVIII, Nos. 1-4 ; vol. XIX, Nos. 1-2.
Journal of Āndhra History and Culture, Vol. I, No. 1.
Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. XI, No. 3.
Journal of the Assam Research Society, Vol. VIII, Nos. 3-4, Vol. IX, Nos. 1 & 2, Nos. 3 & 4.
Journal of Indian History, Vol. XXI, Pts. 1-3, Vol. XXII, Pt. 1.
Journal of Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, vol. III, Nos. 1-2, Vol. IV, No. 1.
Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. XXXII, Nos. 2-4 ; Vol. XXXIII, No. 1, Nos. 2 & 3 ; No. 4.
The Library Bulletin. Vol. I, No. 1.
Man in India, Vol. XXII, Nos. 1-3.
Nagari Pracharini Patrika, Vol. 46, pt. 4 ; Vol. 47, pt. 1.
Nagpur University Journal, No. 6, Dec. 1940.
University of Ceylon Review, Vol. I, No. 1.

BOOKS, PAMPHLETS, ETC.

- Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Government Museum. By C. Sivaramamurti, M.A., Madras Government Museum. Madras 1942.
- An Approach to the Rāmāyaṇa. By C. Narayana Menon, M.A., Ph.D., D. Litt., Benares 1942.
- Annual Bibliography of Indian History and Indology, Vol. II for 1939. By Braz A. Fernandes. Bombay Historical Society, Bombay 1941.
- Ceylon under the British Occupation, 1795-1833, vols. I & II. By Colvin R. de Silva, B.A., Ph.D., Bar-at-Law. Colombo, Ceylon 1942.
- Early History of the Andhra Country. By K. Gopalachari, M.A., Ph.D. Madras University Historical Series No. 16. University of Madras. Madras 1942.
- The Early Muslim Expansion in South India. By N. Venkataramanyya, M.A., Ph.D. Madras University Historical Series, No. 17, University of Madras, Madras 1942.
- The Lalita Cult. By V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, M.A. Bulletin of the Department of Indian History and Archaeology, No. 8. University of Madras. Madras 1942.
- Palni the Sacred Hill of Muruga. By J. M. Soma-sundaram B.A., B.L. Sri Dandayuthapani Swami Devasthanam, Palni.
- A Study on the Chronicles of Ladakh. By Dr. Luciano Petech, Ph.D. Calcutta 1939.
- The Successors of the Śātavāhanas. By Dr. Dines Chandra Sircar, M.A., Ph.D. University of Calcutta. Calcutta 1939.
- Tables Comparing Gupta Inscriptions and Puranic Tradition. By D. R. Patil. Deccan College Research Institute, Poona.

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. X

JULY, 1943

NO. 2

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Articles:	PAGE
On the rôle of the Central Asian nomads in the History of India (P. C. Bagchi)	107
King Sūryavarman I of Kambuja (R. C. Majumdar)	136
Abeyadāna and Patothamya, two interesting temples at Pagan (S. K. Saraswati)	145
A Note on the expression <i>Ṣaṭ-tarka</i> in an Inscription of Champā (Durga Charan Chatterjee)	154
Notices of Books:	
Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, <i>Wayfarer's Words</i> , Vol. II. (N. Dutt); Dines Chandra Sircar, <i>The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Lower Deccan</i> , (U. N. Ghoshal); Colvin R. de Silva, <i>Ceylon under the British Occupation (1795-1833). Its Political, Administrative and Economic Development</i> . (U. N. Ghoshal); Braz A. Fernandes, <i>Annual Bibliography of Indian History and Indology</i> (U. N. Ghoshal); K. Gopalachari, <i>Early History of the Andhra Country</i> (U. N. Ghoshal); Benoy Chandra Sen, <i>Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal (Pre-Muhammadan Epoch)</i> (U. N. Ghoshal.)	157
The Twelfth All-India Oriental Conference, Benares (Suniti Kumar Chatterji)	168
Select Contents of Oriental Journals	172
Additions to our Library	173

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs. LUZAC & CO., 46 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.

Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d., including postage.

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (*i.e.* Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

Membership Rules

1. The annual subscription payable by members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the Journal of the Society free of cost.
2. Resident members may have access to the Society's collection of books, pamphlets and periodicals etc. on application either to the Honorary Secretary of the Society or the Librarian. Calcutta University. The Society's collection is housed by arrangement with the Calcutta University authorities, in the University Library.

Officers and Members of the Managing Committee, Greater India Society, 1943

President—Sir P. C. Roy, Kt. D.Sc.

Vice-Presidents—Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, M.A., F.R.A.S.B.;
Prof. O. C. Gangoly, F.R.A.S.B.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S.B.

Hony. Jt. Secretary—Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D.Litt., (Paris.)

Other Members of the Committee—Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D., Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, M.A., D.Litt., (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt., (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (London.); Mm. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharyya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T.N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-IX already published.

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. X

JULY, 1943

No. 2

**On the Role of the Central Asian Nomads
In the History of India***

BY DR. P. C. BAGCHI

I am grateful to you for the honour you have done me by asking me to preside over this august assembly. The responsibility that you have assigned to me is indeed very great and I am afraid I am not the person who can discharge it to your satisfaction. It seems that the most difficult task of a President is to choose the subject of his address. I have failed to discover a strict principle that might guide us in this matter and make our task easier. The two alternatives before us, I believe, are either to give a survey of the work done in our field of study since we last met or to deal with a particular problem that would interest every one of us. A survey without a proper consideration of the values will be a simple catalogue of works that are more or less known to us. An evaluation of the merits and demerits of such works, again, is beset with difficulties of which we are all aware. I shall therefore choose the other alternative and discuss some problems of the ancient history

* Presidential address at the Sixth Session of the Indian History Congress held at Aligarh, Dec. 26, 1943; Section I, (Ancient India up to 711 A.D.).

of India which, although studied on numerous occasions for more than half a century, have not yet lost their interest to us. I am however fully conscious of my short-comings and I hope you will be indulgent towards me if I ill fulfil my task.

The problems to which I should like to draw your attention are connected with the rôle of the Central Asian nomads in the history of India. While dealing with these invaders, we have been in the habit of attaching greater importance to the foreign sources of information than to our own literature. I do not however deny that for nearly one thousand years, from the end of the second century before Christ up to the eighth, the Chinese sources supply us with more definite information on the movements of the Central Asian nomads than any other source, but there is no reason for attaching greater importance to the Greek and Latin texts than to our own for their early history. In fact the classical writers derived their knowledge of these people either from the Persians or from the Indians. The recent researches into the Central Asian antiquities have shown that the ancient Indians possessed a fairly precise knowledge of these people.

The region beyond the Himalays was never so isolated from India as we often think. The people of Northern India and specially the people of the Punjab possessed some knowledge of this region and were in contact with the nomads almost in every age. They did not consider them foreigners as we do now, simply because the distinction between them, both physical and cultural, was not so great as to create a sharp difference between them. Conflict arose only in cases when the newcomers tried to unsettle the established political conditions, but peaceful infiltration was generally a welcome feature as it contributed to the prosperity of the country and proved an added military strength to the local ruler. The Brahmanical social code always provided them with an independent place in the society. Although it meant the formation of new castes, it

did not hurt their *amour-propre*, but made them willing partners of an ever-growing civilisation.

As early as the later Vedic period the Indian writers show an acquaintance with the people beyond the northern and north-western frontiers. In the *Atharvaveda* (V. 22, 5-9) the fever *taṣman* is wished away not only to the country of the Gandhāris but also further beyond, to that of the Bāhlikas. In the Brāhmaṇa literature we again come across these people (*Śat. Br.* 1.7,3-5). Two new people are also spoken of—the Uttarakurus and the Uttaramadras as distinguished from the Kurus and the Madras settled in the Punjab (*Ait. Br.* VIII, 14, 23). The next writer Yāska who comes immediately after, speaks of another new people—the Kāmbojas probably for the first time (*Nirukta*, II, 2).

The Bāhlikas are well known. It appears that the Uttarakurus, Uttaramadras as well as the Kāmbojas too belonged to the still undefined region of Central Asia beyond the Himalayas. The existence of an Uttarakuru in this region is noted by the Greek writers till the fifth century A. D. Ptolemy is the first to speak of a town named Ottorokorrha and of a river and a mountain bearing the same name in the Serique (Chinese Turkestan) near the mountain Emodos (Himalaya). Later writers speak of the same place under the name Oporrocorra (*apara* and *uttara* here having the same meaning). The tradition survived till the 5th century as Orosius still speaks of the Ottorogorras. The name Uttaramadra might suggest a connection with the Median tribes (the Mādā) and an attempt was made a few years ago to prove that the Maddas or the Madras of the Punjab were Median immigrants to India. Amongst the reasons adduced in favour of this hypothesis stress has been laid on the unorthodox customs prevalent amongst them and mentioned by the *Mahābhārata*. The epic distinctly speaks of the king of the Madras as Bāhlika-puṅgava and thus suggests his connection with the Iranian world.

The Kāmbojas also point to the same direction. Although they are constantly associated with Gandhāra,

still it is impossible to find out their trace on the frontiers of India. The name of Gandhāra survived for long centuries, but that of the Kāmbojas was soon forgotten. This makes it probable that they belonged to the nomad hordes of Central Asia which were moving from place to place. One of their branches seem to have entered India in very early times, but they must have soon lost their identity as a distinct people. Other branches of the same people seem to have entered Eastern Tibet and the valley of the Mekong from another direction. By this assumption only we can explain why the name Kambuja was given to the kingdom founded in the middle valley of the Mekong. In Eastern Tibet also their name can be traced in the name of the province of Khams and it is probably from this region that the Kāmboja invasion of Assam and Bengal took place in later times.

In the early Buddhist texts, the Epics as well as the Purāṇas, we get a more elaborate scheme to systematise the geographical knowledge possessed by the Indians not only of India but also of other Asiatic regions. The principles which guided the compilers of these texts are not always evident, but as some of their notions correspond to actuality, it is not fair to reject the cosmology presented by them as fanciful.

The Buddhist texts mention four continents spread around the central mount Meru in the following order: in the south Jambudvīpa, in the North Uttarakuru, in the West Aparagodāna and in the East Pūrvavideha. Jambudvīpa was generally speaking India, according to the Buddhists. Uttarakuru, as we have seen, was the name given to Chinese Turkestan. Godāna was the name by which Khotan was known in ancient times. The oldest form of the name of Khotan is preserved in the Chinese transcription of the Han period as Yu-t'ien. The Chinese words were pronounced in the Han period as *(g)iu-den i.e. Godāna. The name Aparagodāna thus seems to have been used with reference to the region of Khotan. Pūrvavideha must have meant the eastern zone to the east of

Videha—Videha being the eastern limit of the North Indian world at the time when this geographical notion was first formed.

The Brahmanical cosmology which is sensibly of a later period gives us a more elaborate scheme. Jambudvīpa according to it is no longer India alone, but the entire central belt of the continent as known to the compilers of that age. It is divided into seven *varṣas* or regions of which the first is the Bhāratavarṣa or India. Another known *varṣa* is Uttarakuru. The five other *varṣas* are the Kiṃpuruṣa, Hari, Bhadrāśva, Ketumāla, Ilāvṛta and Ramayaka. As the central mountain of the Kiṃpuruṣavarṣa is mentioned as Hemakūṭa, it is possible that this was the name given to the Himalayan zone. Ilāvṛta might suggest a connection with the region watered by the Ili river further to the north. Jambudvīpa is again only one of the seven continents. Amongst the other continents two, the Śākadvīpa and the Krauñcadvīpa, have been described in detail in the *Mahābhārata*. As we shall see later on, at least the former corresponded to reality.

But although we cannot do full justice to the cosmological notions contained in the Buddhist and Brahmanical texts, there is ample evidence to show that the Indian compilers were acquainted with most of the people of the Central Asiatic regions in the age when these cosmological notions were systematised. For example one of the early Sanskrit Buddhist texts, mentions—Cīna, Kauśika, Khaśa, Bāhli, Tukhāra, Pahlava, Pārata, Śaka, Vokkaṇa, Ramaṭha. The *Rāmāyaṇa* locates to the North of Gāndhāra and Madraka—the Yavana, Śaka, Pārada, Bāhlika, Rṣika, Paurava, Kimkara, Cīna, Aparacīna, Tukhāra, Barbara, Kāmboja, Darada, Kirāta, Taṅkana, Paśupāla. The *Mahābhārata* speaks of the Yavana, Cīna, Kāmboja, Sakṛdgraha, Kulattha, Hūṇa, Pāraśika, Ramaṇa (*sic.* Ramaṭha), Ābhira, Darada, Kāśmīra, Paśu(pāla), Khasira (? Khasa), Pañhava (Pahlava), Girigahvara etc. amongst the people living in the North. The Purāṇas locate in the same region :

Bāhlika, Vāṭadhāna, Ābhira, Kālatoyaka, Pallava, Carma-khaṇḍika, Pārada, Hārabhuṣika, Daśamālika, Kāmboja, Darada, Barbara, Harṣavardhana, Cīna, Tukhāra, Culika, Śūlika etc. The *Bṛhatsaṃhitā* attempts at a more precise classification: in the West—Haihaya, Vokkaṇa, Ramaṭha, Pārata Śaka; in the NW—Tuṣāra, Madra, Kulūta, Carma-raṅga, Ekavilocana (Ekanetra), Śūlika; in the N—Kuru, Uttarakuru, Vāṭadhāna, Hūṇa and in the NE—Paśupāla, Cīna, Khaśa, Ghoṣa, Kucika.

I will not waste your valuable time on the identification of these tribes, many of which are known to us from previous researches. Yavana, Śaka, Pārada, Kāmboja, Hūṇa, Pāraśika, Cīna are well-known. The Tuṣāras or Tukhāras were the people of Tokharestan. The Carmakhaṇḍikas are supposed to have been the people of Samarcand. The Śūlikas, also known as Cūlikas were the Sogdians. The Kucikas or Kuśikas may be identified with the ancient people of Kucī or Kuchar. Vokkaṇa is identified with Wakhan. The Ekavilocanas remind us of the one-eyed people whom Herodotus locates in the extreme north of Central Asia above the Issedones. The Taṅganas or Taṅkanas may have been connected with the Doṅki or the Tunguse. Although we cannot identify other tribes in the lists referred to above the identities already noted are quite sufficient to prove that from about the second century B.C. to about 500 A.D. the Indian writers possessed a fairly accurate knowledge of the nomadic hordes that were moving about in Central Asia. The cosmological notions recorded by these writers reveal that they possessed also a fairly precise knowledge of the lands beyond the Himalayas. Compared with this, the Greek sources, although indispensable for our modern studies, do not appear to be of any greater value.

Under these circumstances I should like to attach a greater importance than hitherto done to the Puranic accounts of the foreign dynasties that ruled in India after the fall of the Imperial Andhras. The accounts say :

"When the kingdom of the Andhras has come to an end there will be kings belonging to the lineage of their servants: 7 Andhras, and 10 Ābhīra kings, also 7 Gardabhins, 18 Śakas. There will be 8 Yavanas, 14 Tuṣāras, 13 Muruṇḍas and 11 Hūṇas (or Maunas)."

"The Śrīparvatīya Andhras will endure 52 years, the Ābhīra kings 67 years, the Gardabhins 72 years, the 18 Śakas 183 years, the 8 Yavanas 87 years. The earth is remembered as belonging to the Tuṣāras 7000 years, according to some accounts 500 (but apparently either 107 or 105 is meant). The 13 future Muruṇḍas along with low caste men, all of mleccha origin will enjoy it half 400 years (i.e. 200 years). The 11 Maunas will enjoy it 103 years. When they are overthrown by time there will be Kailakila kings. Then after the Kilakilas, Vindhyaśakti will reign. He will enter upon the earth after it has known those kings 96 years."

The Ābhīras and Gardabhins mentioned in the list are regarded as kings of foreign origin but we know almost nothing about them. The Yavanas or the Bactrian Greeks have been recently treated by M. Tarn, a recognised authority in classical studies. I propose to discuss here the problems concerning the Śaka, the Tuṣāra, the Muruṇḍa and the Hūṇa.

The Śaka Problem

If we take the Puranic accounts literally, we have to admit that the Śaka conquerors preceded the Yavanas or the Greeks in India. At least they were elder contemporaries in their Indian adventures. The Puranic evidence has, however, not been given any credence for want of corroborative facts. The Chinese evidence has been relied upon to prove that the Śakas could not have entered India before the commencement of the 1st century B. C. The Greek rule had been established in the Punjab and in the Kabul valley about a century earlier. In fact this is regarded as the reason for

which the Śakas came to India not directly by the Kabul route, but from Drangiana which they had conquered in the middle of second century. Let us now examine the evidences again and see how far they are precise enough to admit of such interpretation.

The Greek writers from the time of Herodotus speak of the Śakas as a branch of the Scythic people which occupied Central Asia in early times. Herodotus says that the Persians used the designation Śaka in a loose way. Strabo (58 B. C.-21 A. D.) tells us that the Caucasus separated the Sakai, the Scythes and the Seres in the North from the Indians in the South. Ptolemy in the second century B. C. says that the eastern frontier of the Sakai was Scythia.

The Old Persian Inscriptions speak more clearly of the Śakas than the Greek texts. Thus in the Behistun Inscription there is mention of Bactria, Sogdiana, Gandhāra, Saka, Tathagush, Arachosia and Maka, and again after Parthia of Margiana, Tathagush and Saka provinces which revolted against Darius. In the Persepolis inscription we are told that the eastern provinces of the empire were Arachosia, India, Gandhara, Saka and Maka. In the Nakshi Rustum Inscription there is mention of Zranka (Drangiana), Arachosia, Tathagush, Gandhāra, India, Saka Haumavarka, Saka Tigrakhauda, and in the Gold Tablet Inscription of Darius we are told that his empire extended from Saka beyond Sogdiana (para-sugdāma) to Ethiopia and from India to Sardis. The Saka Tigrakhauda or the "Śakas who wore pointed helmets" were according to Herodotus the neighbours of the Bactrians and most probably occupied the Jaxartes region. The Saka Haumavarka who were the same as the Amyrgian Scythians of Herodotus were those who had settled in the Persian Province of Drangiana. The Behistun and the Persepolis inscriptions really locate them near Gandhāra. The old Persian Inscriptions therefore make it clear that the Śakas were living near the frontiers of India long before the Greeks had come to that region.

The Indian literature speaks of them, but only at a time when the Greeks had settled in Bactria. This is the reason for which the Śakas are closely associated with the Yavaṇas in these texts, specially in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Manusmṛhitā* and the *Mahābhārata*. But a particular chapter of the *Mahābhārata* inseried in the Bhīṣmaparva which gives the description of the Śākadvīpa or "the land of the Śakas" seems to bear an earlier stamp. It is said that there are seven mountains in Śākadvīpa, named Meru, Malaya, Jaladhara, Raivata, Śyāma, Durgasāila and Keśara. The land is divided into seven *varṣas*: *Mahākāśa* near Meru, *Kumudottara* near Malaya, *Sukumāra* near Jaladhara, *Kaumāra* near Raivata, *Manikāñcana* near Śyāma, *Maudākī* near Keśara and *Mahāpuruṣa* near Durgasāila. The text then says that there are four Janapadas or kingdoms in the land of the Śakas, *Maga* (or *Maṅga*), *Maśaka*, *Mānasa* and *Mandaga*. These regions are watered by different branches of the Ganges viz. *Sukumāri*, *Kumāri*, *Śītāśi*, *Venikā*, *Manijalā*, *Cakṣu* (i.e. *Vakṣu*), and *Vardhanikā*. Regarding the character of the people the text then says that the Magas are Brahmin by vocation, *Maśaks* Kṣatriya, the *Mānasas* Vaiśya and the *Mandagas* Sūdra.

According to Rapson this Śākadvīpa would be the name given to the lower Indus valley after the Śakas had settled there in the first century B. C. This identification has been suggested by the use of the word *dvīpa* in this connection. The word *dvīpa*, however, was used in the Puranic and Epic cosmology in a much broader sense and not in the narrow sense of island. Then again there is little doubt about the identification of the river *Vakṣu* (*Oxus*) which flowed through the country of the Śakas. Another river, the *Śītāśi*, may be the same as the *Śītā* which is the name given to the Yarkand river in some texts. According to an old notion all the four rivers, *Gaṅgā*, *Sindhu*, *Vakṣu* and *Śītā*, issued from the same source, the *Anavatapta* lake, and hence they could be known under the same name *Gaṅgā*. Of the four people mentioned above the

Maga reminds us of the Magians, the Maka of the old Persian inscriptions who according to Herodotus were a Median tribe. The Maśakas may be very well identified with the Massagetae another Scythic people mentioned by Herodotus as a powerful and valiant people dwelling towards the east beyond the river Araxes over against the Issedonians. It may be noted that the Masakas are also described in the *Mahābhārata* as Kṣatriyas. The Mandagas or Madagas might have been the same as the Mada or the Medes. The names of two of the *varṣas* seem to correspond to things known from other sources. Kumudottara may be connected with the Komedoi of the Greek writers which extended from the Oxus to the river of Karategin. Mahākāśa reminds us of Akhasa which the classical authors place in Scythia. The difficulty in identifying the names of mountains and rivers is due to the fact that the old names have often been replaced by new ones in this region.

That the Śakas were known in India before the establishment of the Greek rule is also indirectly suggested by the Jaina account as preserved in the *Kālakācāryakathānaḥ*. In order to punish the autocratic Gardabhallas of Ujjayinī Kālaka sought for outside help. He could have gone to the Yavanas as well had they been settled in the upper Indus valley. But instead of doing that he went to the Sagakula i. e. the Śaka race beyond the Indus. He induced some of the Śaka chiefs to accompany him. They crossed the Indus in ships and went to Kathiawar. These chiefs first occupied the kingdom of Surāṣṭra and divided the country amongst themselves. Next they went up to Ujjayinī, imprisoned the Gardabhilla king and set up one of their chiefs as ruler there. In course of time (*kālāntareṇa*) Vikramāditya the king of Mālava ousted the Śaka dynasty and established his own era (58 B. C.). This dynasty also was destroyed by another Śaka ruler after 135 years of the Vikrama era had elapsed (78 A. D.). Prof. Sten Konow has given full credence to this story. The route followed by the Śaka chiefs indicates that they were coming from the other side

of the Indus, probably from Seistan where Śaka settlements had been established already in the Achaemenian period. But how long did they rule in Ujjayinī before the rise of this legendary Vikramāditya in 58 B. C. is not known. The account vaguely says *ḱālāntareṇa* : after the lapse of some-time. Prof. Konow has referred to a late Jaina tradition which says that the Śakas ruled at Ujjayinī only for four years. Accordingly the Śaka occupation of Ujjayinī may be placed in 61-60 B. C. But the same account attributes a reign of only 13 years to the Gardabhillas. A little examination shows that it is only a distorted version of the Puranic accounts which however assign a reign of 183 years to the Śakas and 72 years to the Gardabhillas.

One of the oldest Śaka rulers of India, Maues had extended his rule up to Taxila and Gandhāra, but we do not know from which direction. Most of the scholars now agree that it was from the Śaka settlements in the lower Indus valley. But we should not forget that although some of his coins appear as imitations of the coins of Demetrios and Appollodotus the great majority of them bear Parthian influence in the regal formula—*Basileus basileun Megaloy Mayoy*. Orosius speaks of a Parthian invasion of India up to the Hydaspes by Mithradates I (171-138 B. C.). But this account has been given little credence for insufficient reasons.

If we attach less importance to the story of the foundation of a powerful Greek kingdom extending from the Kabul valley to the Punjab after the invasion of Demetrios, and Menander—a kingdom which would be a sort of impenetrable barrier against a possible Parthian or Śaka invasion from the side of Bactria, then we can explain things more clearly. The Śakas had undergone a great Parthian influence, the language they spoke was the Eastern Iranian dialect and they had rendered a great help in the foundation of the Arsacidan dynasty. So a possible Parthian invasion of the Punjab by Mithradates I, as Orosius tells us, might have brought the Śakas to the Punjab along the Kabul valley.

The Greek opposition would be futile in that case. The Śakas of Kathiawar and Ujjayinī represented an altogether different branch of the same people that had penetrated through the lower Indus valley at a much earlier period possibly with local help as the *Kālakācāryakathanaka* would have us believe,

What is then the importance of the Chinese account regarding the movement of the Śaka people from the region of Ta-hia? The annals of the former Han dynasty *Ts'ien Han shu* contain the following account which is now well known :

“Formerly when the Hiung-nu subjugated the Ta Yue-che, the latter migrated to the West and gained the dominion over Ta-hia whereupon the king of Sai moved south and ruled over Ki-pin. The Sai were scattered and at times formed several kingdoms. North-west of Shu-lei, the Heu-suen, Suen-tu and consanguinous nations are all descendants of the ancient Sai.”

The Chinese word Sai was pronounced in Han times *Sek* and hence it is certain that the word was used to render the name of the Śakas (Greek Saces). The Ta Yue-ches were defeated by the Hiung-nus in 176 B. C. They ousted the Śakas from the Jaxartes region in about 160 B. C. The Śakas then migrated to Ta-hia (later Tokharestan). Pressed by the Wu-suns the Yüe-ches moved to the south and occupied Ta-hia. It was then that the King of the Śakas was obliged to move further south and to go to Ki-pin. This must have taken place before 128 B. C.

The route to Ki-pin which the Śaka king followed is clearly stated. He passed the *Hien-tu* or the hanging passage while moving towards Ki-pin from his original seat in Ta-hia. This route was recognised by Chavannes and Sir Aurel Stein as the Bolor route through the Yasin valley. This was the route which was usually followed by the ancient travellers from the region of Wakhan to the Indus valley and to Kashmir and Udyāna.

If we follow this Chinese account literally, we are driven to two conclusions; the first, that the Śakas who were turned out of Ta-hia by the Yue-ches entered India by the Bolor route and the second, that Ki-pin which they conquered was Kashmir. The first conclusion has been discarded on the ground that the Bolor route was impracticable and the second has been rejected on the ground that Ki-pin could not be Kashmir but must be identified with Kabul-Kapiśā. It has therefore been supposed that the Śakas went south from Ta-hia and as it was impossible for them to enter the Kabul valley owing to the presence of the Greeks in that region they went westwards to the direction of Herat and thence southwards to Seistan. From Seistan they entered India by the lower valley of the Indus in the first century B. C. and thence extended their influence northwards to the Kabul valley.

I think that this assumption is not necessary at all. The Śakas of Ta-hia seem to have represented an entirely different group and had no relation with the Śakas of Seistan. The Bolor route again was not probably so impracticable as has been supposed. At least it does not appear to have been impracticable in the end of the 4th century A. D. when the first Chinese traveller, Fa-hien and his associates came to India.

Then again the identification of Ki-pin with Kabul-Kapiśā is an impossibility. Lévi and Chavannes were the first to propose the identification of Ki-pin of the Chinese annals with Kashmir. They pointed out that in a number of Chinese translations of Buddhist texts the translators use Ki-pin for translating the name Kashmir up to 581 A.D. Since 581 A.D. the Buddhist translations as well as other Chinese documents use the name Ki-pin to denote Kapiśā and not Kashmir. In recent years there has been a tendency to take these conclusions too lightly. For example Tarn in his book "The Greeks in Bactria and India," while identifying Ki-pin with Kophene (Kabul), refers to Lévi only to point out that "the Chinese mixed up Kapiśā and Kashmir in their

Ki-pin." The Chinese writers made this confusion only after 581 A.D. as Ki-pin had by then become too old a name to convey a precise geographical import. But there is no ground to believe that the same confusion existed prior to 581 A.D. In the oldest Chinese translation of the *Milinda-pañha* which belong to the 4th century A.D. Kásmīra of the original text is twice rendered in Chinese as Ki-pin. The Chinese biography of Kumārajīva contains another corroborative evidence. Kumārajīva was taken from Kucha to Kashmir by his mother for proper education in the third quarter of the 4th century A.D. Kashmir was then a reputed centre of Sanskrit learning. While coming from the west they crossed the river Sin-t'eu (Sindhu) in order to go to Kashmir which is called Ki-pin. Of the description of Ki-pin which we get in the Chinese annals of the Han and Wei periods, the following points may be noted: (i) Ki-pin was to the south-east of Ta Yue-che i.e. Ta-hia. The kingdom of Nan-tu was at 9 days journey to its north-east and Wu-yi-shan-li to the south-west. Nan-tu seems to be *Dar-du i.e. Darada. Wu-yi-shan-li which is a transcription of the name Alexandria has been identified with Kandahar. (ii) The valley of Ki-pin was surrounded by hill ranges on four sides. It was a flat country having a length of 800 li from east to west and a breadth of 300 li from the north to the south. These accounts seem to refer clearly to Kashmir and not to Kabul-Kāpīśā. The name Ki-pin itself seems to suggest the same. In Han pronunciation the first word *Ki* was definitely a **Ka* probably followed by some consonant which might have been a *s*. *Pin* was pronounced almost certainly in early time *pir* or *wir*. Hence Ki-pin clearly stood for **Ka(s)-pir* or **Ka(s)-wir*. This form of the name is also found in the early Greek records in which Kashmir is either Caspiri or Kaspeira. Ki-pin was thus a correct phonetic transcription of the old name of Kashmir. The Śakas of Ta-hia could not have come to Kashmir via Seistan and the lower Indus valley—they must have come there by the shorter route—i.e. the Bolor route from Ta-hia.

The Tukhāra Problem

The next problem is what I should like to call the Tukhāra or Tokharian problem. In the dynastic lists of the Purāṇas it is said that the Tuṣāra kings succeed the Yavanas in India. Their number is given as 14. According to the *Matsya* the world belonged to them for seven thousand years (*sapta-varṣa-sahasrāṇi*) whereas according to the *Vāyu* and *Brahmāṇḍa* they ruled for *pañca-varṣa-śatāni* which may be interpreted either as five hundred years or as 105 years. Five hundred years would be too long a period for 14 kings and so it is just probable that they ruled only for 105 years. The *Matsya* account may be accordingly corrected as *sapta-varṣa-śatāni* and interpreted as 107 years. Some of the early Purāṇas give Tukhāra as a variant of Tuṣāra. It is certain that the cerebral was pronounced as *kha* when the name was adopted by the Puranic chroniclers. The *Rāmāyaṇa* gives the name as Tukhāra. The name is given in the same form by the *Mahābhārata* as well as by two old Buddhist texts, the *Saddharma-smṛtyupasthāna* and the *Mahāmāyūrī*. The Chinese pilgrims tell us that the Tukhāra Buddhists like the Ceylonese had a special monastery built for them at the Mahābodhi in the 7th century. In the same century Bāṇa writes in his *Harṣacarita* that Harṣa used to get taxes from the mountainous and inaccessible region of the Tuṣāras (*atra paramēśvareṇa tuṣāraśailabhuvo durgāyāḥ gṛhitaḥ karaḥ*). This only shows that Tukhāra as a distinct people and the land of the Tukhāras (Tokharestan) as a distinct country in the mountainous regions beyond the frontiers of India were known to the Indians as late as the middle of the 7th century A.D.

The classical authors mention the people under the same name. Thus Pliny says—"After the Attacores (the same as Ottorokorras) come the Phuni (Phrūni), Thocari and Casiri (which seems to be a mistake for Caspiri), the last belonging to India." Ptolemy speaks of them as Thagouroi, Periegetes (2nd century) and all later writers up to the 4th century as

Tochari. The Tokharians therefore according to these sources were a central Asian people living to the north of the Caspian or Kashmir.

The Chinese sources of the Han period speak of a people named Ta-hia. They were living as early as the 2nd century B.C. in the Oxus region. The two Chinese words Ta and hia were pronounced in early times as D'a-g'a and it stood in all probability for the name Dogār or Tūkhār. From the 5th century the name appears in the Chinese annals as T'u-ho-lo *T'u-zuo-la i.e. Tūkhāra. The king of that country sent ambassadors to China in 453, 457 and 465 A.D. At the time when Hiuan-tsang visited the country it had passed into the hands of the Western Turks. The pilgrim tells us that Tokharestan in that period was a very extensive kingdom. It reached the Tsong-ling (the Pamirs) on the east, Persia on the west, the Hindukush on the south and the Iron Pass or Derbend in the north. The Oxus flowed through this country. Henceforth contact with China remained almost uninterrupted for about two centuries. It is in this period that the Tibetan texts speak of the country of Tho-gar or Tho-dgar and of the Buddhist monks of that country who had gone to Tibet to participate in the work of translation of Buddhist texts. The Uigurs also speak of them as Tozri and of their country as Twzrstn i. e. Tokharestan.

We therefore see that from about the second century B.C. to about the middle of the 7th century A. D. all sources of information, Sanskrit, Greek, Latin and Chinese concur in recognising a people called Tūkhāra living in the country which came to be known in later times as Tokharestan. The original seat of the people was the Upper valley of the Oxus in the region of Badakshan. The Puranic sources would have us believe that kings of this Tūkhāra origin conquered India from the Greeks and set up their own rule. Fourteen of their rulers reigned in India for a little over hundred years.

These are precisely the rulers who are designated Kushan by the modern historians of India. The Greek legends on the coins of these rulers give them the name Korsano Kosano etc. and the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions Kuṣana, Khuṣana and Kuṣana. The name of a king of this group of rulers called Mahārāja Guṣana may be connected with the same name. The occurrence of the initial letter as *g*, *k*, *kh*, and Greek *k* and *x* shows that it was probably a guttural fricative which could not be exactly rendered into an Indian form. Prof. Konow probably rightly considers that the word is an Iranian form with the genitive plural suffix of *āna* which is used as a rule with the Iranian ethnic names. In that case the base would be Guṣa or Kuṣa. In fact one of the Kushan rulers, Kanishka is described as a member of the Kuśa race in a Buddhist text ascribed to Aśvaghoṣa who according to the Buddhist tradition was contemporaneous with that great ruler.

In order to explain the origin of this family name an evidence contained in the old Han annals has been referred to. According to it the Kuṣaṇas would be a branch of the Ta Yue-che nomads of whom a branch was called Kuei-shuang. The passage which contains this evidence occurs in the annals of the later Han dynasty *Heou Han shu*. Let us consider this passage again :

"Previously the Yue-ches were conquered by the Hiung-nus. They then went away to Ta-hia and divided this kingdom into five hi-heous namely Hieu-mi, Shuang-mi, Kuei-shuang, Hi-tuen and Tu-mi. More than hundred years after this the hi-heou of Kuei-shuang named K'ieu-tsieu-k'io attacked and vanquished the four other he-heou, called himself king and the name of his kingdom become Kuei-shuang. He invaded Ngan-si, conquered Kao-fu, became victorious over P'u-ta and Ki-pin and possessed these kingdoms entirely. K'ieu-tsieu-k'io died at the age of more than 80 years. His son Yen-kao-chen became king in his place, in his turn he conquered T'ien-chu (India) and established there a chief to administer it. From this time the Yue-ches

became extremely powerful. All the different countries call their king, the king of Kuei-shuang, but the Han call them Ta Yue-che retaining their ancient title."

The names of the two kings K'ieu-tsieu-k'io and Yen-kao-chen have been corrected as K'ieu-tsio-kie and Yen-kao-mi by no less a Chinese authority than Prof. Pelliot. When these corrections are admitted, the names appear in their archaic pronunciation as K'iəu-dz'iəu-kiäp and läm-kau-mjie. These may be restored accurately as Kuju Kapa and Vema Kaḍi which are exactly the names of Kujula Kadaphises and Wema Kadphises. According to the latest interpretation of the passage it would appear that the five hi-heous belonged to the old kingdom of Ta-hia or the Tukhāras. They temporarily became vassals of the Ta Yue-che, but later on the hi-heou of Kuei-shuang supplanted the Yue-che rule and established his own. He was therefore a Tukhāra, but the Chinese writers followed the old custom and continued to call them Ta Yue-che. Thus Kujulo Kadphises who supplanted the Yue-che rule was primarily a Tukhāra and secondarily a Kuei-shuang. So far as the first appellation is concerned the Indian sources amply confirm it. It was the Tukhāras who followed the Greeks in India and they were not known by any other name. As Chinese evidence shows, Kuei-shuang was the name of the principality over which Kujula ruled as a hi-heou. This was the name given to the kingdom founded by him after the overthrow of the Yue-che rule simply because the nucleus of that kingdom was his own principality. Kuei-shuang was not an ethnic name and hence the Sanskrit sources do not mention it but retain the name Tukhāra.

The connection between Kuei-shuang and Kuṣāṇa is not very clear. Kuei-shuang, in old pronunciation Kjwei-siang, was something like Khuṣāṇa or Kuṣāṇa. Kadphises I uses both Koṣano and Xosano on his coins. In the Panjtār inscription of the year 122 there is mention of a Mahārāja Guṣāna and in the Taxila silver scroll Inscription of the year 136 there is mention of Mahārāja Rājātirāja. Devaputra

Khuṣaṇa. The titles show that they were two different rulers but who they were, we do not know. There is again reference to the *Guṣaṇavarṃśa* and its scion General Lala in the year 18 of *Kaṇiṣka* in the *Manikiala Stone Inscription*.

This uncertainty in the use of the name *Kuṣaṇa* is more the reason why we should attach greater importance to the ethnic name *Tukhāra* given not only in the *Purāṇas* but also in all other sources.

We have said that the *Tukhāras* were not the *Ta Yue-ches*. They continued to be so called by the Chinese historians by mistake. The *Ta Yue-ches* had probably merged into the *Tukhāra* people and adopted the local culture. This is the reason why they are only vaguely remembered by the Chinese historians. They are last mentioned only in connection with the *Kidarites*. A Chinese annal (*Pei-she*) tell us that king *Ki-to-lo* (*Kidāra*) of *Ta Yue-che*, driven by the *Juan-juan* shifted to the town of *Po-lo* (*B'ak-la* : *Balkh*) and then conquered Northern India and the 4 kingdoms to the north of *Gāndhāra*. The annal then says that *Kidāra* had asked his son to occupy the city of *Fu-leu-sha* (*Puruṣapura*) and that this is the reason why the kingdom of his son was called *Siao Yue-che* or *Little Yue-che*.

This brings us to another question, that of the *Little Yue-ches*. Some scholars are still inclined to hold that *Kaṇiṣka* belonged to the *Little Yue-che* and that he entered India from Chinese Turkestan by a different route. The late Baron de Staël Holstein was the first to put forward this theory. He was of opinion that the *Kidarites* were called *Little Yue-che* because the tradition of the *Little Yue-che* was being perpetuated at *Peshawar* by the successors of *Kaṇiṣka*. But we have seen that the Chinese text is quite clear on this point. The text first speaks of the *Great Yue-che* kingdom of *Kidāra* then of the kingdom founded at *Peshawar* by his son. The latter was called *Little Yue-che* so that it could be distinguished from the kingdom of the father. The annalist had no knowledge of the fact that there was a king called *Kaṇiṣka* and that his capital was at

Peshawar. And he was writing in the middle of the 5th century A.D.

There is a slightly earlier evidence on the Little Yue-ches. In a Buddhist text translated in 413 Kumārajīva translates the name Tukhāra as Siao-Yue-che or Little Yue-che. Kumārajīva was a native of Central Asia and therefore the information supplied by him on this point should be seriously considered. Prof. Pelliot would like to explain it thus: "After the rupture of relation between China and the West in the last quarter of the 3rd century the Great Yue-ches had been forgotten in China. Only the Little Yue-ches were spoken of. As Kumārajīva was writing for the Chinese he used the terminology known to them in his times and rendered the name Tukhāra as Little Yue-che because they were the only Yue-ches whose name was still understood. Otherwise it is inconceivable that a native of Central Asia would explain the name Tukhāra as Little Yue-che who had never come to Ta-hia and had been driven by the Hiung-nus to the South-East to Kan-su".

There is therefore no reason to think that Kaniṣka was a Little Yue-che. The Little Yue-ches had lost their identity amongst the barbarians of South-Eastern China just as the Great Yue-ches had lost theirs amongst the Tukhāras. Besides these Little Yue-ches had no connection either with Ta-hia (Tukhāra) or with Kuei-shuang (Kuṣaṇa).

There is another point to which I should like to draw your attention in this connection. It is the confusion in late literature between two different names the Tukhāra and the Turuṣka. In the *Garuḍa* and *Vāmana Purāṇas* we have Turuṣka and Turaṣka in the place where we should have expected Tukhāra or Tuṣāra. Kalhaṇa while speaking of the Shahi rulers of Afghanistan who claimed descent from Kaniṣka calls them Turuṣka. Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* probably refers to the same Shahi rulers as Turuṣka sākhī (959-Turuṣkāstu sākhayaḥ syuḥ). But we know definitely that the Turuṣkas were the Turks and different from the Tukhāras. In a Chinese-Sanskrit lexicon of

the 7th century A.D. which I edited a few years ago, the Sanskrit name of the Tu-kiues (Turks) is given as *Truṣka-gaṇa*. Tokharestan had passed into the hands of the Western Turks in the 7th century and since then it was natural for all late Sanskrit writers to make an easy confusion between *Tukhāra* and *Turuṣka* just as the earlier Chinese writers had done in calling the *Tukhāras* *Yue-che* after the *Yue-che* conquest of the country.

The Mūruṇḍa Problem

Although the *Muruṇḍas* are regarded as a separate dynasty of rulers who succeeded the *Tukhāras*, some scholars would consider them as identical with the *Śakas*. Sten Konow explains the word as a *Śaka* word meaning "Lord", "Master" and takes it to be identical with the Chinese expression *Sai-wang* "the king of the *Śakas*" which the annalists use in connection with the *Śaka* migration from Central Asia. Konow's reading and interpretation of the word *muroḍa* in the Zeda inscription is far from certain. Its connection with *Muruṇḍa* is still more improbable.

On the contrary the *Purāṇas* consider the *Muruṇḍas* as quite distinct from the *Śakas*. All of them agree in stating that the *Muruṇḍas* followed the *Tukhāras* in India and that 13 of their kings ruled in India along with low caste men, all of *Mleccha* origin. The duration of their rule was according to some sources 400 years whereas according to other sources 200 years. Who were these *Muruṇḍas*?

We know that the *Muruṇḍas* were in India before the foundation of the Gupta empire. The Allahabad Pillar Inscription of *Samudragupta* tells us that the *Muruṇḍas* were amongst those who accepted the vassalage of the *Guptas*. The name next occurs in the *Khoh* copperplate Inscription of the beginning of the sixth century. We are told there that the mother of the *Mahārāja Sarvanātha* of *Ucchakalpa* was *Muruṇḍadevī*, also called *Muruṇḍasvāminī*. She was so called probably because she was a princess of the *Muruṇḍa* dynasty.

The mention of the Muruṇḍas is found in earlier texts too. Prof. Lévi was the first to deal with these texts. The Chinese annals have preserved the record of a political mission which was sent to India from the Hinduised kingdom of Fu-nan in Indo-China in the 3rd century A.D. We are told that in the period 222-277 A.D. the king of Fu-nan sent one of his relatives to India. The ambassador started from Fu-nan, went out of the mouth of the river Teu-kieu-li (Takkola?) and following the great bend of the littoral right towards the north-west entered a big gulf which bordered on different kingdoms. At the end of a little more than a year he entered the mouth of the river of T'ien-chu (India). He went up this river, covered a distance of about 7000 li and arrived at his destination. The king of India was taken by surprise to learn that there were such men on the distant shores of the ocean. He sent with him various presents to the king of Fu-nan and amongst them there were four horses of the Yue-che country. The Indian ambassadors who went to Fu-nan along with this mission were met by the Chinese ambassador at the Funanese court. Being questioned he told the latter that the title of the king of India was *Meu-lun* and that the capital where he resided was guarded by two consecutive circles of ramparts and that the ditches were constantly fed by the water carried by canals from the river. The description of the city and the palace as given by the Indian ambassadors reminds one of the splendour of Pāṭalīputra.

The Chinese name, as Prof. Lévi has shown, is a faithful transcription of the name Muruṇḍa. Ptolemy locates the Marundai in the same region, in Eastern India, on the right bank of the Ganges. The Jaina version of the *Sinhāsana-dvātrimśikā* tells us that a Maruṇḍa-rāja was the king of Kānyakubja. The *Prabandhacintāmaṇi* of Merutuṅga tells us that the Maruṇḍarāja had his capital at Pāṭalīputra. Another Jaina legend would have us believe that Pādāliptasūri who was a contemporary of Nāgārjuna had cured a Muruṇḍarāja from a serious disease and converted him to Jainism.

Although these evidences are few and insufficient they are conclusive enough to prove the existence of Muruṇḍa kings in India from the Kushan period up to the Gupta period. The geography of Ptolemy and the Chinese evidence discussed above definitely show that the Muruṇḍas were established in Eastern India in the 2nd and 3rd centuries A.D. and that they possessed at least two important cities, Kānyakubja and Pāṭaliputra, the latter being probably their capital till the rise of the Guptas.

It is therefore permissible to suggest that the Muruṇḍas had come to India along with Tukhāras and that they had set up a kingdom in Eastern India first as vassals of the Tukhāras and then on their downfall as independent rulers. Their connection with the Yue-ches is suggested by the present of the four horses of the Yue-che country which they sent to Fu-nan. Then again when Hemacandra in his *Abhidhānacintāmaṇi* connects them with Lampāka (Lamghan) it does not mean that they were known in his times. He got this information from some older sources which knew that the Muruṇḍas had come by way of Lamghan. That was not the way followed by the Śakas in course of their invasion of India. The Śakas again had gone up to Eastern India and none of the old sources connect the Śakas with Pāṭaliputra. The Muruṇḍas therefore in all probability were a Tukhāra tribe like the Kushans and partially filled up the gap in the political history of India from the downfall of the Imperial Kushans to the rise of the Guptas. This fact was known to the Puranic chroniclers.

It seems we can trace the Muruṇḍas in Central Asia alongside the Tukhāras. The classical writers such as Strabo, Pliny and Periegetes speak of a people called Phrynoi who lived near the Tochari. If we are to believe the evidence of Pliny, the Phrynoi or Phruni lived to the south of the mountain Attacoris, the Tochari lived to the south of the Phrynoi and the Casiri i.e. Caspiri or Kashmir to the south of the Tochari. The name of the Phrynoi could be very well rendered in Sanskrit as Mruṇḍa or Muruṇḍa. The Puranic chro-

niclers had probably some hesitation in rendering the name as such. Thus the *Vāyu-purāṇa* which is in many respects one of the most trustworthy texts renders the name not exactly as *Muruṇḍa* or *Muraṇḍa*, but as *Puruṇḍa* or *Puraṇḍ*. The cerebralisation of the original dental final does not really make any difficulty as it has other examples too.

The Hūṇa Problem

The Hūṇa question, I believe, still remains a problem in Indian history. The reason is this. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvamśa* in connection with the digvijaya of Raghu speaks of the Hūṇas as living on the banks of the Vakṣu or the Oxus. Prof. K. C. Chattopadhyaya in a very learned monograph on Kālidāsa has tried to establish the priority of Kālidāsa over Aśvaghoṣa in the field of artificial poetry. He is of opinion that Kālidāsa lived in the first century B.C. If we accept this theory we have to admit that the Hūṇas were known in India already before the Christian era. On the contrary we have so long maintained that the Hūṇas were not known in India before the fifth century. They appeared for the first time on the Indian soil in the time of Skandagupta (455-467 A.D.) under the distinctive name Hūṇa. They were at that time driven away. They appeared again towards the end of the same century and this time succeeded in establishing an independent Hūṇa kingdom in the Punjab. They ruled up to the second quarter of the sixth century as paramount rulers when they received a crushing defeat at the hands of Yaśodharman of Malwa.

These Hūṇas who appeared in India in the fifth century A.D. were the Hephthalite Huns or the White Huns. Hephthal, Chinese Ye-t'a, was the eponymous hero of the race who in 484 A.D. defeated and killed Peroz, the king of Persia. In Iran the principal centres of these Huns were Badakshan and Bamiyan. It was in this region that Song-yun met them in the beginning of the sixth century. It was from this region that they penetrated into India. It has been so long maintained that they were the only Huns known in India.

But what about the old Hiung-nus of the Chinese annals? After they had driven the Yue-ches away from the eastern part of Chinese Turkestan in the second century B.C. they continued to play an important political rôle in the history of Central Asia for long centuries. Such a powerful people must have been known to the Greek, Latin and Sanskrit writers long before the appearance of the Hephthalites. But under what name were they known?

The Indian literature is not silent on the Hūṇas. The *Mahābhārata* speaks of the Hūṇas and generally in association with the Pāraśikas (*hunāḥ pāraśikāḥ saha*). Amongst the Purāṇas the *Brahmāṇḍa* and the *Viṣṇu* only mention them. But none of these texts can be definitely placed before the 5th century A.D. The *Rāmāyaṇa* which bears the stamp of a more definite age does not mention the Hūṇas. The oldest translation of the *Mahāmāyūrī* which belongs to the 5th century does not either speak of the Hūṇas. Both these sources however know the Śakas, Yavanas and Palhavas.

The classical writers do not speak of the Hunnus before the sixth century. The earlier writers mention another people which may be identified with them. Thus Orosius who wrote in the beginning of the fifth century or towards the end of the 4th says: "Between the sources of the Ganges and those of the river Ottorogorras, situated to the north in the region of the Paropanisades mountains, the Taurus mountain extends. The Caucasus mountain extends between the sources of the Ottorogorras and the town of Ottorogorras through the country of the Chuni, Scythes and Gandarides." The variants given in the different manuscripts for Chuni are Chunos, Funos, Hunnos, Hunnus.

The Hiung-nu of the Chinese annals looks like the Hunnus of the Latin writers of the sixth century and like the Hūṇa of the Sanskrit literature and inscriptions mentioned from the end of the fifth century onwards. We should however bear in mind that Hiung-nu is the pronunciation of about the same period. The earlier pronunciation of the Chinese name was *xi³ong-nuo*. It commenced

with a guttural fricative which disappeared in later pronunciation. This guttural fricative was transcribed by the earlier classical writers as *Khu*. Towards the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth it had already changed into *Hu*. It is to this stage that the Latin Hunnus and Sanskrit Hūṇa belong.

It is thus clear that although the Hiung-nu hordes might have been known in India under a different name they could not be mentioned as Hūṇa before the fifth and sixth centuries A.D. In this connection I would propose to make another correction of a common error. A Roman historian of the 4th century tells us that in *circa* 358-360 A.D. the king of the Chionitae named Grumbates helped king Shapur II of Persia against the Romans in the siege of Amida. Cunningham suggested that the Chionitae were either the Kushans or the Tokharoi. But we have just seen that they were probably the same as the Chuni or the Hiung-nus. It is possible that they were in this period quite mixed up with the Tokharoi but they cannot be on any account called Kushan.

The Puranic accounts tell us that the Muruṇḍa kings were followed in India by the Hūṇa rulers. Although some texts give the variant Maṇḍa, Hūṇa seems to be the correct reading. They had eleven rulers who reigned for three hundred years. From the Inscriptions however we know only of two Hūṇa rulers namely Toramāṇa and Mihirakula. They reigned from about 490 A.D. to 540 A.D. Yaśodharman's victory only put an end to the growth of the Hūṇas as an imperial power in India. The Hūṇa rule must have continued in the Punjab for several centuries that followed and the Puranic chroniclers are probably right in attributing to them a reign of about 300 years. It was the disintegration of the Hūṇa kingdom in the Punjab that led to the rise of different ruling clans in Northern India.

The problem of the Hūṇas is interconnected with the problem of the rise of some of the early medieval dynasties in Northern India and although these problems fall outside

the scope of our section I shall take the liberty of making some suggestions regarding them here. I will not enter into the origin of the Rajput clans who are now regarded by most of the scholars as of Scythic or Hūṇa origin. My remarks will be confined only to the consideration of certain facts which have not been so far properly noted. The first of this concerns the origin of the Gurjaras. They are looked upon as a Hūṇa race although their name has not been as yet traced to any Central Asian source. In order to do this we have probably to go to the old race movements in that region. The Han annals speak of three different people the Hiung-nu, the Wu-sun and the Yue-che. When the Hiung-nus turned out the Yue-ches from their original home, the latter were compelled to migrate first to the country of the Wu-sun which was in the region of the Ili river. The Wu-sun subsequently drove the Yue-ches out of their country with the help of the Hiung-nus. We are told in this connection that the minor king of the Wu-sun was brought up amongst the Hiung-nus. It is just possible that the Wu-sun had Hun affinities. The old pronunciation of the name 'Uo-suen in all likelihood commenced with a consonant which was later on dropped and that consonant was most probably a guttural. In the 4th century the name was something like *Gusur* which gave rise to the name *Gujar*. The Wu-sun or the Gujars must have moved to India along with the Huns in the fifth century A.D. and on the downfall of the Hun kingdom set up their own rule.

The Turks were also of Hun origin. The ancestors of the Turks were a group of Hiung-nu families bearing the clan name *Assena*. The word *Türk* in old Turkish meant "mighty." The Chinese name *Tu-kiue* was based on a Mongol plural *Türk-küt*. The Sanskrit name *Turuṣka* was established through such intermediate forms as *Turuk*, *Turukku*. The Turkish power rose in the 6th century and in the 7th century, shortly after 638 A.D., the chief of the Turks drove back the Persians to the West and conquered all the old Hepthalite dominions up to the frontiers

of Kabul. The Turks had taken Balkh and Herat as early as the year 589 and in 599 we hear that they were assisting their vassals the Kushans and the Hephthalites against the Armenians and the Persians.

The Turks had a hierarchical organisation beginning with the princes of the blood up to the officer of high ranks. The first was called *teghin* who were princes of the blood. The officers of the highest official rank were called Kulu-chür. It was suggested long ago that the Sanskrit word *Thākura* was an adaptation of the Turkish word *teghin*. It is just possible that the dynastic name Kalachuri is also of Turkish origin. The founders of the dynasty were at first the Kuluchür or the highest Turkish officials. They had set up an independent kingdom when the central power had weakened. It is to be noted in this connection that the Kalachuris claimed descent from Sahasrabāhu Arjuna. In spite of the fact that the latter is celebrated in Indian mythology he reminds us of Assena from whom the innumerable Turkish hordes claimed their descent. If we thus assume that the Turks had come to India along with the Huns or shortly after them, we can explain a significant reference to them in a Haihaya Inscription. We are told in this inscription that Kokkalla "plundered the treasuries of Karnāṭa, Vaṅga, Gurjara, Konkana and Śākambhari kings and also those born of the Turuṣka and Raghu families." The Gurjara-Pratihāras claimed descent from the Raghu family. But who were those born of the Turuṣkas? I believe that they were the Kalachuris and such other Turkish tribes that had followed the Huns in India.

* * *

I have now come to the end of my address. If I have not quite solved the problems, I hope, I have succeeded in impressing on you that the problems exist. The migration of the Central Asian nomads to India is an essential corollary to the Indo-Iranian conquest which brought the Vedic civilisation to this country. The Central Asian nomads represented other ramifications of the same civilisation that

spread from eastern Iran right up to the frontiers of China through mountain gorges and desert sands. Hence their contribution to the development of Indian civilisation increased its complexity by introducing traits that were analogous but distinct in forms. This phenomenon repeated itself almost in every age throughout the period with which we are just now concerned. I therefore believe that not only the political history but also the history of the art, society and religion of the entire period has to be studied against this wider background. Only then we will be in a position to follow step by step the evolution of our great civilisation.

King Suryavarman I of Kambuja

DR. R. C. MAJUMDAR

Sūryavarman I played a prominent part in the history of Kambuja at the beginning of the eleventh century A. D. and we possess quite a large number of inscriptions belonging to his reign. But there are many obscure points in his history, on some of which important theories have been propounded in very recent times. It is necessary to review them in order to find out to what extent, if any, the prevailing views about the life and times of Sūryavarman I require revision and modification.

1. *The struggle for the throne.*

Sūryavarman suddenly appears on the stage of Kambuja politics on the death of Jayavarman V, the last ruling member of the illustrious family founded by Indravarman. This event took place in 923 Ś. (= 1001 A.D.) and in that very year Udayādityavarman I as well as Sūryavarman issued inscriptions as rulers.¹ Two years later another ruler Jayavīravarman appears on the scene. All these clearly indicate that the death of Jayavarman V was followed by a dispute for succession and there were at least three claimants for the throne.

Until recently the view was generally held that Sūryavarman and Jayavīravarman were identical. It was first propounded by Aymonier who believed that the new ruler at first assumed the latter name, and changed it, after a few years, for the former. M. Finot found a corroboration of this in the fact that both these rulers are expressly said

¹ The inscriptions of this period of civil war, referred to in this article, are arranged chronologically in *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 422-425.

in their records to have ascended the throne in 924 Ś. (=1002 A.D.).² M. Coedès has, however, demonstrated³ that this view is untenable. He has referred, in the first place, to an inscription engraved on a stele found at Pràsàt Khnà, which incidentally mentions that a family of *chowrie*—bearers served thirteen kings from Jayavarman II to Sūryavarman I. Now there are only twelve kings during this period if we regard Jayavīravarman and Sūryavarman as identical, and we get the requisite number 13 only if we regard them as separate rulers. This inference is supported by an analysis of the records bearing the names of these two rulers. The name of Sūryavarman appears in records bearing dates (in Śaka era) 923, 924, 928, 930, 933 and the following years, while Jayavīravarman issued records dated 925, 927 and 928. It is thus no longer possible to support Aymonier's view that Jayavīravarman was the name assumed by Sūryavarman during the first few years of his reign. Further, an analysis of the findspots of the inscriptions bearing these two names, and dated between 923 and 929, shows that while those of Jayavīravarman are generally found in the west, in Angkor region, those of Sūryavarman are confined to the north-eastern part of Kamboja.

We must, therefore, hold that Sūryavarman and Jayavīravarman were different persons and both contested the throne of Kamboja. As mentioned above both claim to have ascended the throne in 924 Ś. This creates no difficulty so far as Jayavīravarman is concerned, for his earliest record is dated 925 Ś., and we may easily presume that he proclaimed himself king one year earlier. But as we have one record dated 923 expressly mentioning Sūryavarman as the ruler it is not easy to understand the statement in the later records that he ascended the throne in 924 Ś.

An explanation is probably to be found in the attitude of these rulers to Udayādityavarman I. Two records of

² BEFEO., Vol. XXVIII, p. 73, f.n. 3.

³ BEFEO., Vol. XXXIV, pp. 420 ff.

this king, both dated 923, have been found at Koh Ker and Prāsāt Khnà, in the northern part of Kambuja. No record of his of any later date has yet been found. According to the Prāsāt Khnà⁴ Inscription Udayādityavarman's mother was the elder sister of the queen of Jayavarman V, the preceding king, and the younger sister of Rājapativarman, the general of the same king. This relationship is not, of course, such as would make us believe, without further evidence, that Udayādityavarman was the legitimate heir to the throne. But it proves in any case that he was related to Jayavarman V, and this cannot be said of either Sūryavarman or Jayavīravarman. It is, therefore, a reasonable assumption that Udayādityavarman succeeded Jayavarman V immediately after his death in 923 Ś. Sūryavarman certainly, and Jayavīravarman probably, contested this accession, and Udayādityavarman was defeated and probably killed in 924 Ś. When, after his death, the struggle for the throne was confined between the two other rivals, both chose to regard Udayādityavarman as the legitimate heir and counted their accession to power only from 924 Ś. the date of his death. This is the only plausible explanation of the fact that while the record of Sūryavarman as king is actually dated 923 Ś. the date of his accession to the throne is given in several records of later years as 924 Ś.

Whether Sūryavarman contested the throne immediately after the death of Jayavarman V or rebelled against Udayādityavarman I after the latter had ascended the throne is not definitely known. But the second view seems probable. Verse 7 of the Prah Khan Inscription might throw some light on this point, but unfortunately its meaning is not quite clear. Referring to Sūryavarman it says:—

"Raṇastho rājasāṅkīrṇād rājño rājyaṃ jahāra yaḥ /"

Finot who originally edited this inscription⁵ translates the passages as follows:—

"He took away in battle the sovereignty of a king mixed

4 BEFEO., Vol. XI, p. 402.

5 BEFEO., Vol. IV, p. 672.

with other kings." The crucial word in the verse is '*rāja-saṅkīrṇād*' which qualifies '*rājño.*' Finot's translation 'mixed with other king' does not seem to convey much. According to Sanskrit lexicons the word '*saṅkīrṇa*' means also 'intoxicated' and 'of mixed caste', while '*saṅkīrṇa-yuddha*' means a 'confused fight,' 'a melee.' It is, therefore, possible to interpret the verse so as to mean that Sūryavarman seized the kingdom by defeating its ruler who was either of impure origin or of a haughty character, or because there was a confused fighting for it among many kings. In other words, he justified his action on the ground that the king was an undesirable person or that there were many aspirants to the throne whose mutual quarrels led to a state of chaos and confusion in the kingdom. But whatever interpretation we accept, and irrespective of the question whether the pleas put forward by Sūryavarman are true or not, the verse in question seems to indicate that Sūryavarman fought with one who was generally recognised as king. This king was most probably Udayādityavarman I. Whether Sūryavarman raised a revolt against him because he was considered undesirable or stood as a claimant to the throne when the power and authority of Udayādityavarman was being challenged by others, it is difficult to say. But that Udayādityavarman ruled for some time before Sūryavarman entered the field against him seems to be the most reasonable view.

The dated records of Sūryavarman and Jayavīravarman, referred to above, prove beyond doubt that both ruled in different parts of Kambuja at least up to the year 928. Subsequently Jayavīravarman was defeated and Sūryavarman ruled over the whole of Kambuja, as is proved by his numerous records. Some light is thrown on the struggle between these two rivals by an inscription discovered at Tuol Don Srei which states that Sūryavarman had to carry on a struggle for nine years.⁶ Perhaps this refers to his

6 BEFEO., Vol. XXXIV, p. 427.

fight with Jayavīravarman. In that case we may assume that this contest went on from 924 Ś. to 932 Ś. when Jayavīravarman was finally defeated and Sūryavarman became master of the whole kingdom. This view is supported by the ten inscriptions, all dated 933 Ś., eight of which are engraved on the pillars of the *Gopuram* leading to the inner court of the royal palace of Angkor Thom, and two on gateways of a neighbouring building.⁷ They contain the identical text of an oath, and the names of district officers numbering more than four thousand, who took it in the presence of the sacred fire, the *ācāryas* and the *Brāhmaṇas* offering unswerving and life-long homage and allegiance to king Sūryavarman and dedicating their lives to his service. These officers swore that they 'shall not honour any other king, shall never be hostile (to their king) and shall not be the accomplices of any enemy.' This somewhat extraordinary record may not unreasonably be assumed to indicate the termination of the civil war and an attempt on the part of the victorious king to take effective steps to prevent its recurrence.

2. The origin of Sūryavarman

Sūryavarman, who thus succeeded in defeating all his rivals, does not appear to have any legitimate claim to the throne. Long after he had been firmly seated on the throne claims were made to connect him, though remotely, with the old royal families. The *Prāsāt Kev Inscription*⁸ says that he was born in the family of Indravarman. The *Phnom Pra Vihar*⁹ Inscription repeats the same thing and adds that his queen Śrī Vīralakṣmī was born in the royal line of Śrī Haṇṣavarman and Śrī Īśānavarman. This is corroborated by *Prāsāt Khnà Inscription*.¹⁰ On the other hand

7 *BEFEO.*, Vol. XIII (6), p. 11.

8 *ISCC.*, p. 97.

9 Aymonier—*Cambodge*, Vol. II, pp. 208-9.

10 *Inscriptions du Cambodge*, Vol. I, p. 196.

the Vat Thipedi Inscription¹¹ connects him with the maternal family of Indravarman. The Lovek Inscription¹² also probably refers to Sūryavarman as descended from the maternal family of Jayavarman V, but as a portion of the verse is missing, one cannot be sure of the interpretation. These vague statements seem to indicate that Sūryavarman had no legitimate claim to the throne by his relationship with any of his immediate predecessors, though he and his queen probably belonged to aristocratic families which claimed some relationship, however remote, with the royal family of Indravarman.

It is necessary, in this connection, to discuss the theory propounded by M. Coedès,¹³ that Sūryavarman was the son of a Malyan king. This view is based on a passage in *Cāmadevivamsa*, a Pali chronicle composed about the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D. It is recorded in this chronicle that the king of Kambuja, the son of the king of Siridhammanagara, attacked Haripuñjaya (Lamphun in N. Siam) about twenty years before its inhabitants emigrated to Sudhammapura (Thaton in Burma). This latter event, which is also referred to in other chronicles, probably took place about 1056-7 A.D. The king of Kambuja who took Haripuñjaya must have therefore ruled about 1036 A.D., and Coedès therefore argues that he should be identified with Sūryavarman I. In support of his view that Sūryavarman was the son of the king of Siridhammanagara or Ligor in Malay Peninsula, Coedès points out (1) that he had no relationship with the preceding rulers of Kambuja viz. Jayavarman V and Udayādityavarman I; (2) that he was the first Kambuja king to assume the title *Kaṃtvan* which is derived from the Malay word *tuan* (chief); (3) that he was a follower of Buddhism of which Siridhammanagara (also called Nagara-Śrī-Dharmarāja) was a stronghold; (4) that according to the chronicles the king of Śrī-Dharma-

¹¹ *Melange S. Lévi*, p. 213.

¹² *ISCC.*, p. 122.

¹³ *BEFEO.*, Vol. XXV, pp. 24-25.

rāja had conquered Lavo (Lopburi) and it is from this town that the king of Kambuja proceeded to invade Haripuñjaya; and (5) that the earliest Khmer inscriptions found at Lopburi belong to the time of Sūryavarman.

Cœdès' view is undoubtedly very ingenious and seductive, but is open to some very serious objections. In the first place, although many of the records of Sūryavarman, as noted above, refer to his connection with the old ruling families of Kambuja, not the least reference is made anywhere to the fact that his father was a ruling prince. It may be argued that the court-poets did not like to refer to his foreign origin, but this could have hardly prevented them from dilating on his royal family, at least in a general way. Secondly, as Cœdès has himself pointed out, the early records of Sūryavarman all come from the north-eastern region while those of his rival Jayavīravarman belong to the Angkor region in the west.¹⁴ This shows that he first established his power in the eastern regions and had no authority in the west. This is hardly compatible with the view that he was the son of a local ruler in Malay Peninsula and must have therefore presumably invaded Kambuja from the west. Besides, we must remember that *Cāmadevīvaṃsa* is not a historical work and its statements must be accepted with caution. Further, the date of the invasion of Haripuñjaya by the king of Kambuja, arrived at by piecing together a large number of scattered data in the chronicles cannot be fully relied upon. On the whole, therefore it is difficult to regard Cœdès' view as anything more than a mere tentative hypothesis.

3. *Social and religious activities.*

Sūryavarman had a great leaning towards Buddhism, for his inscriptions contain invocation to Buddha along with that to Śiva and his posthumous name was Nirvāṇa-pada. He issued edicts containing regulation about monasteries in

¹⁴ BEFEO., Vol. XXXIV, p. 424.

which it is laid down that the ascetics and Buddhist monks should offer to the king the merits of their piety.¹⁵ But although he might have adopted the Buddhist faith, he did not give up the official Śaiva creed and constructed both Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava temples.

The Pra Khan Ins.¹⁶ contains the following verse about Sūryavarman :—

“*Bhāṣyādi-caraṇā kāvya-pāṇiṣ=śaḍ-darśanendriyā/
Yanmatir-dharmaśāstrādi-masākā jñāgamāyata/*”

This refers to the king's proficiency in Bhāṣya, Kāvya, Six Systems of Indian Philosophy and Dharmaśāstra. Other records refer to his knowledge of *Atharvaveda*, Yoga and Pāṇini's Grammar. Even allowing for the exaggeration of the court-poet, we may regard Sūryavarman as a learned scholar. This intimate acquaintance with the orthodox Hindu literature probably led him to initiate some social reforms. The Prea Kev Ins. contains the following verse about him :—

“*Śrī-Sūryavarmanṇo rājye varṇṇabhāge kṛtepi yaḥ/
Saṃpadam prāpya śaḍ-bhaktiṃ varṇṇa-śreṣṭhatva-
sāṃsthitaḥ/*”

The expression ‘*varṇṇabhāge kṛte*’ literally means that he instituted the system of caste. But this view is hardly acceptable. For we get reference to castes in Kambuja from a much earlier period. Even Jayavarman V, who reigned shortly before, is said to have made, like Brahmā, proper arrangements of *varṇṇa* and *āśrama* (*dhāteva varṇnāśrama-śaḍ-vyavasthāṃ kṛtvā*). Sūryavarman, therefore, regulated the details of the caste system. Although we have no knowledge of exactly what he did, we may well believe that this king, versed in Hindu Śāstras, tried to introduce more orthodox rules in society, and confer dis-

15 Aymonier—*Cambodge*, Vol. II, p. 81.

16 BEFEO., Vol. IV, p. 672.

17 Cf. e.g. Lovek Ins. ISCC., p. 122.

18 ISCC., p. 97.

inction on worthy persons by placing them in higher social ranks.¹⁹

His fondness for innovation is also seen in the domain of art. He is said to have completed the Hemagiri and the Temple-mountain, two structures begun by his predecessors. It is very likely that these two are respectively the Ta Kev temple and the Phimanakas, and Sūryavarman added to them the peculiar corbelled galleries which were unknown in Kambuja architecture till then.²⁰

On the whole Sūryavarman is a remarkable figure in Kambuja history, having a romantic career and a distinguished personality. He had found Kambuja in a hopeless state of disintegration, torn by civil war and suffering all the miseries of anarchy and confusion. During his long rule extending over nearly half a century (1001-1049 A.D.) he restored peace and prosperity and extended the boundary of Kambuja to the heart of Siam. The oath of allegiance which he introduced as noted before, is taken even today by the royal officials of Kambuja in more or less the same terms. He made a deep impression on posterity, and it is curious to note that the historical chronicles of Cambodia place his name at the head of the list of kings with which they begin.

19 We are told *e.g.* in the verse quoted above from the Prea Kev Ins. that the Brāhmaṇa Śivācārya was placed at the head of his caste. Probably Sūryavarman introduced something like Kulinism in Bengal.

20 This is the view of Cœdès (*BEFEO.*, Vol. XXXIV, pp. 426-27).

Abeyadāna and Patothamya, two interesting temples at Pagan

By S. K. SARASWATI

In a study of the square temples at Pagan I have tried to divide them into three distinct groups, which, however, are found to belong to one common architectural tradition that may be styled as Indo-Burmese.¹ Related to the first group, represented by the famous Ānanda and several other similar examples, there are particularly two interesting monuments, each of which, though with marked affinities with the Ānanda group in respect of its plan, arrangement and main lines of elevation, exhibits one distinct variety in the shape of the crowning superstructure. While every temple at Pagan, irrespective of the group to which it belongs, is characterised by a curvilinear *Śikhara* over a roof of several receding tiered stages, these two are each distinguished by a *stūpa* over the tiered roof. This feature constitutes a significant variation, which necessitates a closer examination of these two monuments, especially as regards their antecedents and possible analogues.

The Patothamya, alleged to have been built by king Ṭaungthuggyi in the early part of the 10th century A.D., and the Abeyadāna, built by the famous Kyanzittha in 1059 A.D., represent the two monuments, that are being referred to here. A proper understanding of the monuments in question along with the various problems regarding their origin and antecedents requires a detailed description of these two singular examples of Burmese architecture. The description given previously may here be reproduced in full. As an architectonic example, we should remember, the Abeyadāna appears to have been anterior to the

1 *JGIS.*, Vol. IX, 1942, pp. 5-28 and pls.

Patothamya, which, according to the current tradition, has been ascribed to an earlier date. It "represents a square structure, raised on a moulded plinth, with a projecting vestibule on one side having entrance doorways on three sides of it. The vestibule is partitioned into a central nave and two side aisles and in the interior of the main square we have the usual circumambulatory corridor, surrounding the solid masonry pile in the centre and lighted with the help of three perforated windows, surmounted by flamboyants, on each of the three sides. In plan thus the present structure closely resembles the Nanpaya and the Nagayon, previously mentioned. Like them too the roof rises in two ogee-shaped tiers directly over the vaults over the corridors, surmounted further by three flat horizontal tiers as the basement for the crowning element. The last, however, presents a variation, not found in any of the monuments mentioned above. Instead of the curvilinear *śikhara*, usual in such structures, we have the bell-shaped dome of a *stūpa*, complete with the cruciform turret of the *harmmikā* and the conical finial of the *chatrāvalī*, as the crowning member of the entire monument. In shape and appearance it closely resembles the bell-shaped *stūpa* monuments of Burma. Each of the ogee-shaped roofs is adorned with a miniature replica of the *stūpa* at each corner, while the main entrance doorway in front of the projecting vestibule is crowned likewise by a similar *stūpa* shrine. The roof of the vestibule as well as those of the main shrine are lined each with a battlemented parapet at each stage. The Patothamya resembles the Abeyadāna in general arrangement and composition. But the superstructure consists of flat roofs, instead of the ogee-shaped ones, in the lower courses and a ten-sided dome with a corresponding *harmmikā* and a conical *chatrāvalī* as the crowning element. The plan also exhibits signs of elaboration and apart from the long projection of the portico on the front side there is a shallow offset projection in the centre of each of the three other sides accommodating a rectangular door-

way. A miniature square turret appears at each corner of the different stages of the superstructure, as well as at the centre of each stage, corresponding to the projection of the vestibule and those of the shallow offsets. The parapet at each stage of the roof is lined with a frieze of *stūpa* replicas, instead of battlements. Barring these variations, which might have been due to gradual elaboration in course of time, the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya resemble each other closely and must be classed as belonging to the same type of monuments. They differ from the Nanpaya-Nagayon-Ānanda group only in the shape of the crowning superstructure. In plan, in composition and in the main lines of elevation both the groups represent the same conception and the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya, each with its bell-shaped *stūpa* as the crowning element, should be regarded as a sub-variety of the Nanpaya-Nagayon-Ānanda group, which has a curvilinear *śikhara* instead.”²

Except these two, no other temple, among the hundreds that still stand at Pagan in various stages of preservation, exhibit this kind of superstructure, which may, on this account, be regarded as a singular feature. The characteristic style of the Pagan temple may also be found reproduced in relief on a number of terracotta votive tablets, discovered from Pagan itself, as well as on a stone sculpture and a terracotta votive tablet from Hmawza or the site of the old city of Prome. In none of these can we discern the *stūpa* as the crowning superstructure of the temple, such as we have in the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya. A *stūpa* raised over a series of gradually receding terraces is, however, a common feature of Burmese architecture and such a *stūpa* is known as the *Zedi* in Burma. But the *stūpa* as the crowning superstructure of a temple raised over a gradually receding tiered roof can on no account be associated or confused with the *zedi*, i.e., the *stūpa* raised over a terraced basement. So as far as our present knowledge goes,

2 *JGIS.*, Vol. IX, pp. 13-15, Pl. IV.

the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya appear to have been without a parallel in Burmese architecture.

Though no exact replica of the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple is known, a structural analogue, at least in exterior elevation, may be found in the small but exquisitely charming temple of Chaṇḍi Pavon in the Kedu plain in central Java.³ In plan as well as in the internal arrangement of the shrine the Pavon offers striking divergences from the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type. It consists of a square (cruciform) cella on a wide basement. The cella is surmounted, however, by a roof of two receding tiers and is crowned by a bell-shaped *stūpa*, supported on a cruciform platform and with the conical *chatrāvalī* as the finial. This *stūpa* is further surrounded by smaller *stūpas* on the second tiered stage, at the corners as well as in the centre of each side. It will thus be seen that, in spite of wide differences, the Chaṇḍi Pavon in Java reproduces in the external arrangement of its roof the prominent characteristics of the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple at Pagan in Burma.

From the simplicity of its design and from the style of carvings the Chaṇḍi Pavon cannot be dated later than the 8th century A.D. and thus antedates the Burmese monuments by at least 2 or 3 centuries. But this is the single instance of such a kind of temple in the whole of Java, and one solitary sample, though earlier, cannot indicate this island as the source or origin of the peculiar type of monuments in Burma, especially when we notice wide divergences between the Burmese and Javanese specimens in many fundamental points. It has already been shown that, in spite of differences in detail, all the square temples at Pagan, including the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya, form a class by themselves, and that in external elevation and appearance, viz. a roof of several tiered stages being ultimately crowned by a superstructure, either a *śikhara*

3 R. C. Majumdar, *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Pt. II, pp. 192-193 & Pl. IV.

or a *stūpa*, they might ultimately be traced to North-Eastern India. In Bengal and Eastern India there have been discovered a number of stone sculptures, each with the representation in relief of a temple, the roof of which rises in several gradually diminishing tiered stages and with a curvilinear *śikhara* on the top of it as the crowning superstructure. A similar type of temple may also be found illustrated in several miniature paintings contained in a manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Cambridge Mss. Add. 1643), dated 135 Nepalese era, corresponding to 1015 A.D.⁴ They illustrate several shrines in different parts of Eastern India, which had already attained celebrity by the time this manuscript was copied. These replicas of temples on sculptures and in manuscript paintings, which tally closely with those on the votive tablets from Pagan, indicate a fair popularity of such a type of temple in Eastern India and a fragmentary example of the type may perhaps be recognised in the colossal temple at Pāharpur in the district of Rajshahi in North Bengal. The points of contact as well as those of divergences between the Burmese temple and the Indian one had been analysed in detail before, but it cannot be doubted that the Indian prototype had a great deal of influence on the evolution of the characteristic monuments of Pagan.

The Abeyadāna and the Patothamya, though included within the characteristic style of the Pagan temples, exhibit a singular feature, namely a *stūpa* over the tiered roof, for which we have no other parallel in Burmese architecture. It should be pointed out in this connection that a miniature *stūpa* as the pinnacle or the summit of a Buddhist temple is nothing new. Being symbolic of the faith it was used as the finial of a Buddhist shrine, just as the *cakṛa* (discus) or the *triśūla* (trident) is placed on the summit of a temple of Viṣṇu or of Śiva. As such its use is very common and frequent both in India and Farther India. In

4 *History of Bengal*, Vol. I, (ed. R. C. Majumdar) pp. 494-95, 503.

the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya the case is, however, different. Here, in each case, the *stūpa* is a part of the structure itself and not merely its crowning finial. Herein lies its singular interest, which adds to the uniqueness of the monuments in question.

The *Drāviḍa* style of temple in Southern India is characterised by a pyramidal elevation of the tower (*vimāna*), which originally consisted of a multiplication of storey after storey, each a replica of the sanctum cella and slightly reduced in extent than the one below, and of a domical member, technically known as the *stūpī* or *stūpiḱā*, as the crowning member of the whole edifice.⁵ Some scholars may find an analogy between the *stūpa* surmounting the tiered roof of the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple at Pagan and the octagonal or hemispherical dome crowning the storeyed stages of the *Drāviḍa* temple. But this analogy fails to bear closer scrutiny. The domical crowning member of the *Drāviḍa* temple might have some superficial resemblance with the hemispherical shape of the *stūpa* and may account for the technical term *stūpī* or *stūpiḱā*. But it should be remembered that the term *stūpī* is also used in *Śilpa* texts to mean merely the top of the tower, whatever its shape might be, as in the case of the *Nāgara* temples.⁶ Moreover, the *stūpī* or *stūpiḱā* crowning the *Drāviḍa* temple lacks the essential component elements of the *stūpa* proper and cannot be legitimately identified or equated with one. The octagonal or hemispherical dome crowning the pyramidal roof of the *Drāviḍa* temple-style cannot be cited hence as an instance analogous to that of the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple.

5 S. K. Saraswati, 'Origins of the Medieval temple styles', *Indian Culture*, Vol. VIII, p. 188.

6 Cf. *Upānastūpīparyantaṃ yugāśraṃ Nāgaraṃ bhavet—Kāmikāgama*, or

Stūpyantaṃ caturasraṃ yan-Nāgaraṃ parikirttim—Mayamata.

The association of the Pagan style of temple as a main class with Eastern India has been possible on the analogy of the relief representations of temples of the Pagan style on tablets and sculptures from Pagan and Prome in Burma with similar replicas that have been found on several stone sculptures in Eastern India. But in none of these do we find the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type represented and one is apt to regard it as only a local and indigenous manifestation of the main style, this main style being indebted for many of its fundamental characteristics to inspiration from Eastern India. But no other structural example of the type, except these two, is known in the whole of Burma, nor is the type represented on any of the numerous votive tablets from Pagan bearing in relief the models of the Pagan style of temple. For a prototype of the Abeyadāna and the Patothamya one has to search the region nearer to the place, whence the original inspiration for the fundamentals of the style came. But neither in the Eastern provinces, nor in any part of India do we find a monument that may approximate, even superficially, the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple.

The Cambridge manuscript of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* (Add. 1643), mentioned above, is of extreme importance to the student of Indian architecture as handing down to us remarkable sketches of many interesting types of monuments that once adorned the different parts of India, but which have well nigh perished and passed into oblivion. Among its miniatures there are representations of famous Buddhist shrines in India, specially Eastern India. Some of these represent interesting architectural types, of which not only no extant examples are known, but even the memory has completely been forgotten. One such type has already been taken note of, namely the temple with the tiered roof crowned by a curvilinear *śikhara*, such as we have on the stone sculptures from Eastern India and votive tablets and sculptures from Pagan and Prome in Burma. There are at least three representations of such

a type among the painted miniatures,⁷ which indicate a fairly frequent usage of the type in ancient days, though not a single example of it appears to exist now. These sketches, coupled with similar relief replicas on sculptures and tablets from Eastern India and Burma, furnish a forgotten, but, nonetheless, important chapter in the history of Indian as well as Farther Indian architecture.

Still more interesting are the three sketches, representing respectively the shrines of Lokanātha in Nāleन्द्रā (Bengal),⁸ of Vaiśālī Tārā in Tīrabhukti (North Bihar)⁹ and of Vajrapāṇi in Uḍḍiyāna.¹⁰ The location of the last is unknown, but there is a volume of evidence in favour of its being situated in Bengal.¹¹ Dr. Benoytosh Bhattacharyya is inclined to identify it with Vajrayogini, a famous centre of Tāntrik worship in the district of Dacca.¹² These sketches, all evidently from Eastern India, represent a significant type of building that was in vogue in this region in the ancient days, but every vestige of which had long been wiped out. Not only there are not a single extant example, but what is more, even relief representations of such a kind of building, such as we have for the other forgotten type, are lacking. These sketches are hence the only records of the existence of such a type of building in Eastern India in days long gone by.

Of the three shrines those at Uḍḍiyāna and Tīrabhukti appear to represent an earlier form. In each of these we find a temple, the roof of which rises in several gradually receding tiers and is surmounted by a fairly big *stūpa*, complete with all its component elements. Some-

7 Foucher, *L'Iconographie Bouddhique*, Pls. III, 4; V, 3; VII, 3.

8 Foucher, *L'Iconographie Bouddhique*, Pl. V, 1.

9 *Ibid.*, Pl. VII, 1.

10 *Ibid.*, Pl. VI, 5.

11 *IHQ.*, Vol. XI, pp. 142 ff.

12 *Journal of the Gangānātha Jhā Research Institute*, Vol. I, pp. 66-70.

times the edge of the tiers is indented, a feature that adds to the decorative effect of the shrine. A more evolved and elaborate form of the type may be recognised in the temple of Lokanātha in Nālendrā, where we find the corners at each stage decorated further with miniature replicas of the crowning superstructure, i.e., the *stūpa* supported on the last tier of the roof. Curious though such a building may be, there can be no doubt that these sketches were no inventions of imaginative artists, but were copied from the actual shrines themselves, which had attained sanctity and celebrity in those days. They appear to have formed a significant architectural type that was in vogue in Eastern India, especially in famous sites of old.

These sketches reproduce the typical characteristic of the Abeyadāna-Patothamya type of temple at Pagan, for which we have no other parallel in Burma, either among the numerous Pagan monuments nor among the relief replicas that we possess of such monuments. The type, however, was certainly in existence in Eastern India before the manuscript was copied, i.e., before 1015 A.D. The Pagan style in its fundamental aspects may ultimately be traced to Eastern India. The Abeyadāna and the Patothamya clearly demonstrate that even in the determining of types and varieties within the style of Pagan temples Eastern Indian architectural tradition played a significant and dominant part.*

[The illustrations have unavoidably been held over till the next issue of the *JGIS*.—Ed.]

A Note on the expression, *Ṣaṭ-tarka* in an Inscription of Champā

BY DURGA CHARAN CHATTERJEE

A Po-Nagar inscription¹ of King Indravarman III of Champā dated 840 *Śaka* (=918 A.D.) in connection with the installation of an image of the goddess Bhagavatī by him, describes the scholarship of the king as follows :

mīmāṃsā-ṣaṭ-tarka-jinendra-sūrmis
śakāśika-vyākaraṇodākaughāḥ
ākhyāna-śaivottara-kaḷpa-mīnaḥ
*paṭiṣṭha ceteṣviti sat-kavīnām*²

Here the expression *mīmāṃsa-ṣaṭ-tarka* has been translated³ as 'the six systems of Philosophy beginning with *Mīmāṃsā*', it being obviously interpreted as *mīmāṃsādi-ṣaṭ-tarka*. By the six systems of Philosophy we often understand the six Brahmanical schools of thought usually known as (1) *Mīmāṃsā*, (2) *Vedānta*, (3) *Nyāya*, (4) *Vaiśeṣika*, (5) *Sāṃkhya* and (6) *Pātañjala*. The six systems as described by the Jaina scholar Haribhadrasūri in his *Ṣaḍdarśanasamuccaya*⁴ are (1) *Bauddha*, (2) *Jaina*, (3) *Nyāya*, (4) *Vaiśeṣika*, (5) *Sāṃkhya* and (6) *Mīmāṃsā*. It is interesting to note that all these six systems have been regarded as *āstika* by Haribhadra. He further observes that *Nyāya* and

1 R. C. Majumdar, *Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*, Vol. I, *Champā*, Book III, pp. 138-139.

2 In the above *Mīmāṃsā* has been shortened to *mīmāṃsa* for metrical reasons. Cf. the well-known dictum *api māṣam māṣam kuryāc chandobhaṅgam tyajed girām* (Mallinātha on the *Raghuvamśa*, XVIII, 23). The inscription in the original as reproduced by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, (*loc. cit.*) reads *śakāśikā*, but this is ungrammatical. *Śakāśika* as approved by grammar and metre may therefore, be suggested in its place.

3 R. C. Majumdar, *op. cit.*

4 *Bib. Ind. ed.*, VI, 77-79.

Vaiśeṣika do form but one school and *Cārvāka* known as *nāstika* (unbeliever) should, therefore, be incorporated in the group in order to have the six systems of thought. The word *tarka* is sometimes used in a specific sense, as in the *Nyāyasūtra*,⁵ and sometimes in the general sense of 'argument' or 'discussion'.⁶ But is there any authority for use of the word *ṣaṭ-tarka* to denote the six systems of Indian Philosophy as they are commonly recognised?⁷

Rājaśekhara (c. 1000 A.D.) in his *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* divides *ānvīkṣikī* into *pūrva-pakṣa* and *uttara-pakṣa*, the former comprising the schools of (i) *Bauddha*, (ii) *Jaina*, and (iii) *Cārvāka*, and the latter consisting of the schools of (iv) *Nyāya*, (v) *Vaiśeṣika*, and (vi) *Sāṃkhya*. And these six systems have been designated by him as *ṣaṭ-tarka*.⁸ Elsewhere in this work,⁹ Rājaśekhara has divided the *Prāmāṇikas* or the experts in the *pramāṇa-vidyā* into two classes—*Mīmāṃsikas* and *Tārkiṇas*, the latter being further classified as adherents of (i) *Sāṃkhya* (*Sāṃkhīya*), (ii-iii) *Nyāya* and *Vaiśeṣika* (*Nyāya-Vaiśeṣikīya*), (iv) *Bauddha* (*Bauddhīya*), (v) *Jaina* (*Arhata*), and (vi) *Cārvāka* (*Lokāyatika*). Jayantabhaṭṭa (c. 1000 A.D.) uses the expression *ṣaṭ-tarka* in his *Nyāya-mañjarī* precisely in the same sense.¹⁰

5 See *Viśvanātha-vṛtti* on *Nyāya-sūtra* I, 1. 40.

6 See *Nyāya-koṣa*, published by Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, Poona, s.v.; also *Nyāya-sūtra*, Bengali tr. by Mm. Phanibhūṣaṇ Tarkavāgiśa, Vaṅgiya Sāhitya Pariṣat, Calcutta, 2nd. ed., Vol. I, pp. 296-306.

7 It is to be noted in this connection that the word *tarka* has been used to denote the number six. See *Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier-Williams, s.v.

8 *dvidhā cānvīkṣikī pūrv-ōttara-pakṣābhyām, arhad-bhadanta-darśane lokāyatam ca pūrvah pakṣah, sāṃkhyam nyāya-vaiśeṣikau cottarah, ta ime ṣaṭ-tarkāḥ* (p. 4).

9 Pp. 36-7.

10 *Ibid.*, Vizianagram Sanskrit Series, p. 4:—*yatas sāṃkhyār-hatānām asyām janatāsu prasiddhāyām=api ṣaṭ-tarkayām*

We thus find that *ṣaṭ-tarka* has come to be used in a specific sense about 1000 A.D. As occurring in an inscription of the same period, it should therefore be taken in the sense of the six logical systems of (1) *Bauddha*- (2) *Jaina*, (3) *Cārvāka*, (4) *Sāṃkhya*, (5) *Nyāya* and (6) *Vaiśeṣika*. The expression *mīmāṃsa-ṣaṭ-tarka* can be interpreted as *mīmāṃsā* and *ṣaṭ-tarka*. *Mīmāṃsā*, as it is well-known, refers to both *Karmamīmāṃsā* and *Jñānamīmāṃsā* or *Vedānta*. Similarly *Sāṃkhya* includes both the atheistic school of Kapila and the theistic school of Patañjali (*Pātañjala* or *Yoga* system). It is, therefore apparent that in the inscription mentioned above *mīmāṃsā* and *ṣaṭ-tarka* taken together stand for all the commonly known schools of Indian Philosophy both Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical, or at least for the logical portions of those schools: they also cover the entire range of *Pramāṇavidyā* which Rājaśekhara recommends for a poet.¹¹ King Indravarman III of the Champā inscription who has been described as one expert as much in abstruse philosophy and grammar as in imaginative poetic art, appears to have followed just what is prescribed by Rājaśekhara, possibly his contemporary in India.

idam=eva tarka-nyāyavistara-śabdābhyāṃ śāstram-uktam. The statement of Jayanta may be summarised as follows: The techniques of inference of the (i) *Sāṃkhya*, (ii) *Jaina* and (iii) *Buddhist* schools do not appear satisfactory and neither are they helpful for establishing the authority of the *Veda*. The logic of the (iv) *Cārvāka* is ridiculously defective and can hardly claim any consideration. The *Vaiśeṣika* being just in agreement with the (vi) *Nyāya* position, need not be regarded as a different system. So notwithstanding what is commonly recognised as the *ṣaṭ-tarka* or the group of the six systems of *tarka*, the word *tarka* or *nyāya-vistara* as one of the fourteen *vidyās* refers alone to the *Nyāya* system of Akṣapāda. For Jayantabhaṭṭa's date, see S. C. Vidyābhūṣaṇa, *History of Indian Logic* p. 47. With *ṣaṭ-tarka*, cf. *Ṣaḍ-darśani*, *Ṣaḍ-darśana-samuccaya*, *Tarka-rahasya-dīpikā*, p. 1, l. 17.

¹¹ *Kāvyamīmāṃsā*, pp. 36-38.

NOTICES OF BOOKS

Wayfarer's Words. Vol. II. By Mrs. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, D.Litt., M.A. London 1941. Pp. 373-719.

It is with a heavy heart that we take up our pen to review the exceedingly thoughtful work of a *savant* who is no more in this world. This work is the second volume of Mrs. Rhys Davids' sporadic writings and lectures (nos. 31-60). Of late Mrs. Rhys Davids has been harping on the theme that Buddha's Buddhism was first distorted by the Pali commentators, particularly by Buddhadatta and Buddhaghosa and then by the present day orientalists, many of whom missed the real sense of a Pali word. Much harm has been done, she says, to the true comprehension of Buddhism by the careless rendering of Pali words and expressions into an European language. There is much force in this remark but the stumbling-block is that to write on Buddhism, one must use some European language as his medium of expression. Mrs. Rhys Davids herself has started using new words and even coining some for this purpose. She rejected some of the hackneyed words used in translations and substituted others which would give more sense, e.g. *Buddha*=Pioneer (p. 473), *Waywitter* (p. 474), *taṇhā*=strong will (p. 481), *brahmācariya*=the God-life (p. 492), *attā*=Man in the mind (not "self" used by Oldenberg and Rhys Davids, pp. 448-450), and so forth. The favourite style of expression adopted by Mrs. Rhys Davids is as follows: "And this was just the object of Sākyan mission; its emphasis lay, not on the Most, Highest, Best, but on the More, the Way in which man could become that More, the carrying out religion, not in ritual, not in assertion of identity with the Highest, but in so living as to be growing, fructifying in that More on the way to the Most" (p. 420).

The above extract gives an idea not only of her style

of writing but also the substance of her new interpretation of original Buddhism. She is of opinion that Buddha took the doctrine of immanence from the Upaniṣads, but he did not recommend the practice of introspection leading to the identification of the self with the Highest, (the "Most" of Mrs. Rhys Davids); he recommended a gradual purification and spiritual uplift, in the words of the authoress he laid emphasis on the "More" which, of course, would ultimately lead to the "Most," the Brahman of the Upaniṣads (p. 602). Buddha, she states, accepted the principle of immanence in Brahmanism of that day, but he rejected the rituals and laid emphasis on conduct, and ultimately, the difference between Brahmanism and Buddhism became widened in the conception of "ātman" which in the Upaniṣads meant "best self," in Buddhist texts "something non-existent," while in Christianity "our worse self" (p. 608). Through all these lectures and writings of late Mrs. Rhys Davids has harped on the theme that Nirvāna originally did not mean either annihilation or a state of peace and rest and happiness; it was the state of immanence "the teaching man how, as wayfarer in the worlds he might, seeking his *attha*, finally become That" (p. 658). In fact, she has been drifting towards Mahāyānic interpretation of Nirvāna, i.e. Tathatā = Thatness, though she says that in "Mahāyāna the cult of words begat a metaphysic of absolutism" while in Hīnayāna (Theravāda) the cult of words begat some psychology and logic. *In both* the founder as a real man, and his real gospel, were practically lost sight of (p. 705)." By forceful reasoning, she wants to establish that Buddha was never antitheistic. Her conclusion is that "Buddhism at its birth was in a fair, true way theistic than other world creeds" (p. 451).

In this review we have tried to indicate the lines in which Mrs. Rhys Davids wanted to interpret Buddhism lately. She has in fact rejected several pet theories of the Palists. She boldly asserts that Buddhism is a reorientation of the Upaniṣadic teaching, that Buddha was more

theistic than any other teacher, and that his Nirvāna was nothing but the Upaniṣadic doctrine of Immanence. In conclusion we may say that this new approach to the problem of Buddhist philosophy should be seriously taken up by the Palists, because there is much force in it as it has come from one who can claim to be one of the greatest Palists of the present day and perhaps the first and the foremost in the studies of Pali Abhidhamma. She has, however, unconsciously drifted towards Maṭāyāna, and accepted the claim of the Mahāyānistā that the Hīnayānic interpretations were superficial. After all, the lectures and writings are thought-provoking and we hope these will be read in the spirit they are written.

N. Dutt.

The Successors of the Sātavāhanas in Lower Deccan. By Dines Chandra Sircar, M. A., Ph.D. Published by the Calcutta University. Pp. xv + 417. Calcutta 1939.

This is a contribution of first-rate importance to the study of the dynasties that ruled in the lower Deccan in the interval between the downfall of the Sātavāhanas and the Cālukya conquest. In his attempt to reconstruct the regional history of the period in question, the author has frequently had occasion to tackle numerous problems of genealogy, chronology and geography, to correct errors of former workers in the field, and to explain a number of technical terms and expressions occurring in the inscriptions such as *āyukta*, *vallabha*, *neyika-naiyogika*, *hiraṇyagarbhodbhavodbhava*, *avasitavividha-divya* and so forth. His discussions are marked not only by a high degree of technical equipment including a thorough knowledge of palaeography and of the relevant general literature, but also by sound judgment and they are always expressed in a clear incisive style. In the result he has not only laid a sound basis for the political history of an important tract in the first few centuries of the Christian era, but has also presented

NOTICES OF BOOKS

illuminating side-lights on its administration and the state of contemporary society and religion.

The work under notice consists of two Parts. In Part I (chs. I-VI) the author deals successively with the history of the Ikṣvākus, the Bṛhatphalāyanas, the Ānandas, the Śālaṅkāyanas, the Viṣṇukundins and the Early Pallavas who ruled the Andhra country in the period in question. Part II (chs. I-IV) reviews the history of the different branches of the Early Kadambas and of the Kekayas who ruled the Kanarese country during the same period. The author has earned the thanks of his readers by including a map at the beginning of his work and by adding ten valuable Appendices and a good Index at its end.

We have noticed a few printing mistakes not corrected in the list of *Addenda et Corrigenda* at the end, such as Puru (p. 10), Andau (p. 162), Arjunāyana (p. 230), Tuṣāspa (p. 322) and Todd (pp. 350-351).

U. N. Ghoshal

Ceylon under the British Occupation (1795-1833). Its Political, Administrative and Economic Development. By Colvin R. de Silva, B.A., Ph.D. (Lond.) Bar-at-law. 2nd ed., 2 vols. Published by the Colombo Apothecaries Co., Ltd. Colombo, Ceylon. Pp. x+639. Price, vol. I Rs. 6/50; vol. II Rs. 7/50.

In this well-documented and scholarly work, which was originally presented as a Doctorate thesis of the London University, the author gives us an admirably thorough and accurate description of the early history of British rule in Ceylon. The work consists of three sections, Political, Administrative, and Economic, with an introduction sketching the condition of the Island just before the British conquest and a Conclusion drawing together the different lines of development at the end. The author's narrative is throughout based on minute and first-hand study of original sources including Manuscript records in the British Colonial Office, the India Office, the British Museum, the Colombo

Archives and the Colombo Museum as well as printed records of Parliamentary debates, old Journals, contemporary works and the like. The author's analysis of historical causes and effects is sound and penetrating, his style is clear and effective, his critical observations are suggestive and stimulating. We can best illustrate our remarks in this last respect by making a few quotations. Commenting upon the fall of the last independent king of Kandy, the author writes (pp. 156-57):—"A petty state, mediaeval in structure, unprogressive in ideas, parochial in policy and diplomacy and rent by internal dissensions, could not anyhow have checked the advance of a modern imperial power. ...But the extraordinary ease with which the British conquest of Kandy was accomplished in a campaign of only forty days excites remark. It is to be ascribed to the disloyalty of the entire body of chiefs and the disaffection of the common people....It was a repetition of an old and tragic tale. The Kandians turned with a too facile readiness to the idea of bringing in the foreigner to settle their domestic differences. That pitcher went once too often to the well. The convenient arbitrator became the permanent master. The Kandians accomplished their own political doom." Again, in bringing his narrative to a close with the fateful year 1833—the date itself is a reminder of the close parallel between modern Indian and Sinhalese history—the author observes (p. 594):—"The year 1833 constitutes a definite and important landmark in the history of Ceylon. After centuries of war, disruption and disunion, the Island had been completely pacified, politically united and administratively consolidated under the British sceptre. The rulers of Ceylon could now turn unhindered, with a reorganised and modernised administration, to the task of opening up the Island and developing its resources....In short, the foundations of the present political, administrative and economic structure of Ceylon were laid during the period 1796-1833, and the reforms of 1833 completed and rounded off that work. Ceylon was firmly set on the highway of

modern development. A new era in her history had dawned."

U. N. Ghoshal.

Annual Bibliography of Indian History and Indology, vol. II for 1939. By Braz A. Fernandes. Published by the Bombay Historical Society, Bombay 1941. Pp. xxiii + 191. Price Rs. 5/.

In recent times the two well-known series of publications, the *Annual Bibliography of Indian Art and Archaeology* and the *Bibliographie Bouddhique* published respectively by the Kern Institute of Leyden and a Committee of scholars with J. Przyluski and M. Lalou at its head, have been of immense service for the cause of Indological and allied studies. It was a matter of extreme regret to all concerned that these two useful series ceased publication in 1939 and 1937 respectively. It speaks much for the enterprise and love of scholarship of the Bombay Historical Society that it was able almost at once to step into the breach by publishing a *Bibliography of Indian History and Research* for 1938 as a Supplement to its well-known Journal. The present volume marks a fresh step in advance as it is published independently with an improved arrangement. It consists of five sections bearing the titles (I) India, Burma and Ceylon (II) Further India and Indonesia (III) Adjoining countries (IV) Islamic world and (V) Miscellaneous. The first and by far the longest section (134 pp.) is divided into a number of sub-sections under appropriate headings. Each Section or Sub-section gives the author's name in alphabetical order along with the titles of the books and references and in some cases short notices of contents. An Index of Authors and a Subject Index brings this useful volume to a close.

In a work of this compass it is easy to pick up defects such as the over-lapping of topics, the omission of important names and the meagre notices of contents of even important books and articles. We have noticed a few

duplications (e.g. nos. 783 and 812) and a number of printing mistakes (such as those under nos. 249, 254, 286, 321, 342, 348, 455 and 746). We have no doubt that with wider experience and with closer co-operation of scholars and learned institutions, the *Annual Bibliography of Indian History and Indology* will overcome all such defects. We wish the new venture a long and prosperous career.

U. N. Ghoshal.

Early History of the Andhra Country. By K. Gopalachari, M. A., Ph.D. Madras University Historical Series No. 16. Published by the University of Madras, 1941. Pp. xiv + 226 and 12 plates. Price Rs. 5/8.

This well-written monograph maintains the high standard of scholarship that we have been used to expect from the series of historical publications issued by the Madras University under the inspiring and skilled guidance of Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri. As the author tells us in his short Preface, "It is an attempt to present a connected history of the Andhras and the Andhra country from the earliest times to the advent of the Eastern Cālukyas." In accordance with this plan the author first deals (chs. I-VI), as exhaustively as the scanty materials will permit, with the much discussed but still far from certain, history of the Sātavāhanas. In the following chapters (VII-XI) he traces with equal ability the less known history of the dynasties following the Sātavāhanas in the Telugu country, viz: the Ikṣvākus, the Br̥hatphalāyanas, the Vaiṅgeyakas (usually called Śālaṅkāyanas), the Kandaras (usually known as Ānandas) and the Viṣṇukuṇḍins. Over and above his reconstruction of the dynastic history, the author has presented in each case valuable notices of the conditions of government, society and religion prevailing in those times.

Presented as a University Doctorate thesis, the present work bears on every page the stamp of ripe scholarship. The author's use of his sources, extending to a

minute and painstaking examination of the epigraphic, numismatic and literary data, is thorough and exhaustive. What is more, his treatment of numerous difficult and disputed questions of history, geography and chronology is marked by critical acumen of a high order.

We propose to offer a few remarks for the consideration of the author in the event of a new edition being called for. The notices of administrative arrangements of the Sātavāhana and other dynasties should include an account of the prevailing land system. It was pointed out by the present reviewer in another connection (*Agrarian System in Ancient India*, pp. 34-37) that the records of the Sātavāhanas and their contemporaries and immediate successors in the Deccan and South India testify to the extraction of revenue from the royal farms and allotments in villages, the land revenue in the proper sense of the term being probably as yet unknown. In the chapters on social conditions the author's notes on dress and ornaments, luxury, military arrangement etc. (pp. 98-104) should be amply illustrated by sketches from the monumental sculptures somewhat on the lines of Mr. C. Sivaramamurti's recently published fine monograph *Amaravati Sculptures in the Madras Museum*. The section on economic conditions should similarly be rendered more vivid by means of sketch-maps indicating the ports, the market towns, trade-routes etc. as far as ascertainable. An attempt should also be made to trace as much as possible the ratio between the different metallic currencies of the Sātavāhanas, the purchasing power of the local currency and so forth. A few misprints e. g. Kalimpur (p. 148n) require correction.

U. N. Ghoshal.

Some Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal (Pre-Muhammadan Epoch). By Benoy Chandra Sen, M. A., B.L., Ph.D. (Lond.). Published by the University of Calcutta, 1942. Pp. lxxviii+613. Price not stated.

This is one of the most important publications on Ancient

Indian history appearing in recent years. Its modest title hardly does justice to its high and varied merits. While inscriptions, naturally enough, form the most important source of his work, the author has laid under contribution all available literary and archaeological data extending from the earliest times to the downfall of the Sena rule in West Bengal at the end of the twelfth or beginning of the thirteenth century A.D. On the many difficult and disputed questions that crop up in the course of his narrative the author writes not only with full knowledge, but also with scholarly sobriety and restraint.

In the course of a long Introduction the author gives a valuable bibliography of Bengal Inscriptions arranged in chronological order along with genealogical and chronological tables of the ruling dynasties and a list of foreign invaders of Bengal. He also presents a welcome *résumé* of the more important results of recent research which could not be incorporated into the body of his work.

The Book consists of three parts. Part I (unfortunately lacking in a map) contains by far the fullest and the most exhaustive account of the ancient geography of Bengal. Here in successive chapters the author passes in review the ample but widely scattered data derivable from Indian tradition and from Greek and Latin sources as well as those of later times classified conveniently under the heads of the broad geographical divisions. A concluding chapter brings together a number of unsolved problems of Ancient Bengal Geography.

In Part II dealing with Political History the author treads a more extensively beaten track. But he treats numerous disputed points of detail with his usual originality, skill and learning. Among the more important topics dealt with by him, we may mention Khāravēla's chronology and his relations with Bengal (pp. 175-192), the identity of Emperor Chandra of the Meharauli Inscription (pp. 200-205), the Gupta imperial succession after Kumāragupta I (pp. 216-224), the chronology of the Dharmāditya group of kings (pp. 252-255), the chain

of events leading to the conflict between Śaśāṅka and Harṣa (pp. 262-271), the chronology of the Khaḍga dynasty (pp. 279-281), early Pāla chronology and Pāla origins (pp. 293-308), the connections of the Kamboja ruling families and especially of king Rājyapāla of the Idra grant (pp. 376-380), the origin of the Senas with especial reference to the significance of the title *Brahmaṣatriya* (pp. 432-455), the origin of the Lakṣmaṇa Sena era (pp. 462-469) and the chronology of the Senas (pp. 469-479).

In Part III the author attempts to give as far as possible a connected account of the public administration of Bengal from Maurya times to the end of Sena rule. In this connection he deals adequately with such important topics as the system of provincial, district and village administration under the Imperial Guptas and their immediate successors (pp. 490-521), the constitutional importance of the election of Gopāla I (pp. 525-528), the significance of administrative titles (pp. 534-553) and the system of provincial, district and village administration under the Pālas and Senas as well as minor dynasties (pp. 554-556).

We have noticed a few slips and omissions not referred to in the list of *Addenda et Corrigenda*, which may be rectified in a later edition. To the list of Bengal Inscriptions (pp. xi ff.) should be added (1) and (2) two Midnapore Sāhitya-Parisat Museum copper-plate inscriptions of Śaśāṅka and (3) Nārāyaṇapur Image Inscription of Mahīpāla I (?). On p. 168 Jaugaḍā should be read in place of Jaugarh. On p. 173 in connection with the discussion of the identity of the Yavana invader of the Gangetic valley mention should be made of Dr. W. W. Tarn's notable theory in his work *The Greeks and Bactrians in India*. On p. 245 the supposed reference in the Aḥṣad inscription of Ādityasena to the slaying of Dāmodaragupta in a battle with the Maukharis should be corrected in the light of Prof. Kṣetresa Chandra Chattopadhyaya's explanation (*D. R. Bhandarkar Volume*, pp. 181-2). On p. 275 the statement about the end of Tibetan rule in India and Nepal in 703 A.D. which is based on E. H.

Parker's paper in the *Journal of the Manchester Oriental Society* should be properly verified. (For a different view on this point see the *History of Bengal*, vol. I, published by the Dacca University, p. 93). On p. 435 the statement that Hari was put to death along with Bhīma should be rectified. In the chapter on administration under the Pālas and Senas (p. 549) notice should be taken of the interpretation by the present reviewer (*Hindu Revenue System*, pp. 219-220) of the title *Daśāparādhika* which has been practically left unexplained. On p. 541 the explanation of *gaulmika* as 'Superintendent of Forests' is a slip. In connection with references in Sena grants (pp. 569-570) to the income from lands and villages, mention should be made of the reviewer's suggestion (*op. cit.*, pp. 265-66) of the substitution by the Senas of a system of cash payments for the older rule of payment in kind.

The high value of the present work, which in its original form secured for its author the Doctorate degree of the London University, has not been diminished by the recent publication by the Dacca University of the *History of Bengal*, vol. I, although the first ten chapters of the latter work cover exactly the same ground. The present author has done well in adding a good index extending over thirty-five pages of closely printed matter at the end.

U. N. Ghoshal

The Twelfth All-India Oriental Conference, Benares

BY DR. SUNITI KUMAR CHATTERJI

The Twelfth All-India Oriental Conference took place at Benares in the premises of the Benares Hindu University under the auspices of the University on the 30th and 31st December 1943 and the 1st and 2nd January 1944. The conference is held every two years—the last session was at Hyderabad, Deccan. This year the General President was Rao Bahadur Dr. S. K. Belvalkar of Poona, eminent Sanskritist of present-day India. There were 14 sections for the different branches of Indology, including a *Pandita-Parishad* or Gathering of Sanskrit scholars of the old type which was presided over by Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Giridhar Sarma Chaturvedi, Principal of the Maharaja's Sanskrit College, Jaipur. The other Sections and Sectional Presidents were the following: (1) *Vedic*—Dr. Kunhan Raja, Professor of Sanskrit, Madras University; (2) *Iranian*, Dr. J. M. Unvala of Navsari; (3) *Islamic History and Culture*, Dr. S. M. H. Nainar, Madras University; (4) *Arabic and Persian*, Dr. M. Iqbal, Oriental College, Lahore; (5) *Sanskrit*, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. P. V. Kane, Bombay; (6) *Religion and Philosophy*, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr. Umesh Mishra, Ailahabad University; (7) *Pali and Buddhism*, Dr. P. V. Bapat, Fergusson College, Poona; (8) *Prakrit and Jainism*, Prof. Hiralal Jain, Amraoti; (9) *History and Geography*, Dr. H. C. Ray, Ceylon University; (10) *Archaeology*, Rao Bahadur C. R. Krishnamacharlu, Superintendent of Epigraphy, Madras; (11) *Philology and Indian Linguistics*, Dr. S. K. De, Dacca University; (12) *Technical Sciences*, Prof. P. C. Das Gupta, Calcutta; (13) *Hindi*, Rai Bahadur Dr. Shyamsundar Das, Benares. It has been decided to add a new section from the next session onwards, that on *Dravidian Studies*.

There was quite a large attendance, all the Universities and a great many learned bodies in India being represented, and Benares as the intellectual centre of Hinduism naturally attracted a good number of delegates. One delegate represented China—Dr. F. K. Li (Li Fang-Kuci), who is a distinguished linguistician of Modern China. Dr. Li was sent by the *Academia Sinica* and the *Sino-Indian Cultural Association* of Chung-king, and, in addition to attending the Conference, Dr. Li intended to make a tour of India and to form contacts with our scholars particularly in Indology and in Linguistics with a view to future collaboration in scholarship relating to Sino-Indian and other cultural matters, including linguistic investigation of Indian languages of the Sino-Tibetan family. The visit of Dr. Li was thus highly significant, and although foreign delegates had attended the all-India Oriental Conference before, it was the first time that we had an official representative from our great neighbour China. It is hoped that the coming of Dr. Li from China, combined with the interchange of students between India and China which has already taken place and with the interchange of professors which may be arranged for in the near future, will usher in a new era of Sino-Indian fellowship through study and research into the culture of Asia and Asiatic peoples—a prospect which the *Greater India Society* cannot but contemplate with pleasure. There are already some Chinese scholars and students resident in Calcutta, at Santiniketan (in the *Cīna-bhavana*, an Institute of Chinese Research) and at Sarnath near Benares, and in addition to Dr. Li, some of these scholars from China (notably Mr. T. F. Chou, who is studying Sanskrit and Indian languages in India) also attended. There were two delegates representing Poland, Dr. Maryla Falk of Calcutta University, and Dr. Ludwic Sternbach.

The Conference was formally opened at 12 on the 31st December by the Pro-Chancellor of the University, Maharajadhiraj Sir Kameshwar Singh of Darbhanga in the

Sayajirao Library Hall, after which Dr. Belvalkar read his presidential address. The *Pandita Parishad* and the different sections held their meetings, and over 200 papers were contributed by scholars. There were three symposia arranged in which distinguished specialists took part—(1) *Who overthrew the Kushaṇa Empire—the Bhāraṣivas, the Vākātakas, or the Yaudheyas?* (2) *The Vikrama Era* (the present year, 1944, corresponds to year 2000 of the Vikrama Samvat, and in various places in India celebrations of the commencement of the third millennium of the Vikrama Era are being held, so that this subject had a special topical interest in the present conference); (3) *the Data of the Mahabharata War*; (4) *the Authenticity of the Bhāsa Plays*; and (5) *Hindi as the Lingua-Franca for India*. The last symposium was held under the joint auspices of the *Linguistic and Modern Indian Languages Section* of the Conference and the *Linguistic Society of India*, and as the subject had a very wide appeal, there was a large gathering of both members of the Conference and of the public.

The *Linguistic Society of India* employs the occasion of the All-India Oriental Conference to hold its two-yearly sittings, and this time also the Society held its session. The report of the Society for the last two years was read by the secretary, Dr. Sukumar Sen of the University of Calcutta, and new office-bearers were elected with Dr. Suniti Kumar Chatterji as President. The Society brings out its *Quarterly Journal Indian Linguistics* and seeks to constitute an important forum for all higher linguistic work in India.

The papers contributed to the different sections were (as naturally would be the case) of diverse quality with a few echoing fantastic theories and views, but there were some important articles. The Aryan and non-Aryan question is coming larger and larger into prominence, and in Linguistics, slowly the Indian investigators are extending the scope of their researches into Indo-European. Topics of Greater Indian interest were conspicuous by their absence, this year, unfortunately. There was a solitary paper on *Relation*

between Bengal and China in Ancient Times by Dr. D. C. Ganguli of Dacca University, together with another on *Early Arab Expeditions to India* by Mr. M. A. Khaliq, M.A. of Delhi. We only wish that Indian scholars turned their attention to this aspect of Indology, and devoted greater attention to the question of Indian contacts with other countries of Asia, particularly in ancient and mediæval times.

The Conference, on the whole, was a great success, both academically and socially. Apart from the papers and learned lectures there was a lunch (vegetarian and purely *d l' indienne*) given by the Chancellor of the University, His Highness the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir, and At Homes given by the Maharajadhiraja of Darbhanga, by the *Nāgarī Pracārīṇī Sabhā* (Academy of Hindi Literature) of Benares, and by Sir Vijaya of Vizianagram. Visits were paid to see the collections of the *Nāgarī Pracārīṇī Sabhā* (old pictures, MSS., sculptures and remains from recent excavations of Sarnath), and the members were taken to see the ruins of Sarnath and the recent Buddhist temples and other establishments there.

Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the Vice-Chancellor of Benares Hindu University, and Dr. A. S. Altekar, the local Secretary, together with the staff and student volunteers of the University were all attention to the guests, and considering the present situation in India, through the Japanese carrying on air raids on the soil of India and through acute famine in Bengal and elsewhere and general economic dislocation and distress all over India, the Conference was a brilliant success and was one of the most important events during the year in the cultural life of present-day India.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. XI, Pt. 1.

H. W. Bailey.—*Iranica* [Exegetical notes on a number of words including Arabic Barmak traced through Bactrian to Skt. *Pramukha* used in various Khotanese texts as a title of the head of the Buddhist monastery].

Lionel Giles.—*Dated Chinese Manuscripts in the Stein Collection, VI. Tenth Century*. [A valuable catalogue of documents from Tun-huang including the oldest printed sheet in the world. Containing a large variety of miscellaneous prayers, eulogies, certificates, contracts, etc., it illustrates the growing poverty and political unrest of the region and shows how Buddhism, though, still the dominant religion, had degenerated since the great days of the T'angs].

University of Ceylon Review, April 1943, Vol. 1, No. 1

C. E. Godakumbura.—*References to Buddhist Sanskrit Writers in Sinhalese Literature*. [Contains a large number of quotations and other references traced to their Buddhist Sanskrit sources].

Journal of the Ceylon Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1943, vol. XXXV, pt. 4.

S. Paranavitana.—*A Nāgari Legend on some Sinhalese coins*. [Gives the correct reading as *Aka* which is a pure Sinhalese word for a class of coins mentioned in Sinhalese literature and tenth century inscriptions].

ADDITIONS TO OUR LIBRARY

The Greater India Society begs to acknowledge with thanks the receipt of the following periodicals and books since the last notice in *JGIS.*, Vol. X, No. 1.

Periodicals

- Adyar Library Bulletin, Vol. VII, pts. 3 & 4.
Bhāratiya Vidyā Patrikā, Vol. I, pts. 7-12; Vol. II, pts. 2 & 3.
Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Vol. IV, Nos. 3 & 4.
Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, Vol. XI, pt. 1.
Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XIX, No. 3.
Journal of Āndhra History and Culture, Vol. I, No. 3.
Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. XII, No. 1
Journal of Indian History, Vol. XXII, pts. 2 & 3.
Journal of Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, Vol. IV, No. 2.
Nagari Pracharini Patrika, Vol. 47, pts. 3 & 4.

Books, Pamphlets, Etc.

- Arabica and Islamica. By U. Wayriffe. Luzac & Co., London 1940.
Chandragupta Maurya and his Times. (Sir William Meyer Lectures, 1940-41). By Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji, M.A., Ph.D., Madras University. Madras, 1943.
Excavations at Rairh. By Dr. K. N. Puri, B.Sc., D. Lit., (Paris). Department of Archaeology and Historical Research, Jaipur State.
Wayfarer's Words, vol. II. By Mrs. C. A. F. Rhys Davids, D. Litt., M.A., London 1941.

Printed and Published by Sj. J. C. Sarkhel, Manager, Calcutta Oriental
Press Ltd., 9, Panchanan Ghosh Lane, Calcutta.

Sir Marc Aurél Stein Memorial Number—Part I

THE JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XI

JANUARY, 1944

No. 1

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Articles:	PAGE
In Memoriam—The late Sir M. A. Stein (Dr. N. P. Chakravarti) ...	1
The Colophon of the Jātaka-stava (Prof. H. W. Bailey) ...	10
The term <i>Agśāla</i> in two Kharoṣṭhi Inscriptions (T. Burrow)	13
Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India (Dr. S. Paranavitana)	17
The Tamil land and the Eastern Colonies (Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri)	26
Geographical Notes on the Kurram Valley (Dr. V. S. Agrawala)	29
Background of Sufism in Indian Environment (M. L. Ray Chaudhury)	31
Editorial Notes :	42

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs. LUZAC & CO., 46 Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.

Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d., including postage.

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (*i.e.* Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

Membership Rules

1. The annual subscription payable by members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the Journal of the Society free of cost.
2. Resident members may have access to the Society's collection of books, pamphlets and periodicals etc. on application either to the Honorary Secretary of the Society or the Librarian. Calcutta University. The Society's collection is housed, by arrangement with the Calcutta University authorities, in the University Library.

Officers and Members of the Managing Committee, Greater India Society, 1944

President—Vacant.

Vice-Presidents—Rao Bahadur K.N. Dikshit, M.A., O. C. Gangoly, Esq., Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, D.Litt.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Hony. Jt. Secretary—Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A., D.Litt. (Paris.)

Other Members of the Committee—Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D., Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, M.A., D.Litt., (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt., (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (London.); Mm. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharyya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt., (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T.N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-X already published.



Sir Marc Aurel Stein
(1862-1943)

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XI

JANUARY, 1944

No. 1

Sir M. A. Stein

BY DR. N. P. CHAKRAVARTI

Marc Aurel Stein was born at Budapest, Hungary, on the 26th of November 1862. He was a son of M. Nicholas and Anna Stein. Nicholas Stein, who was a merchant in Zombar and Budapest, had his son educated in his early years in the public schools of Budapest and Dresden. After finishing his early education, young Marc Aurel joined the Universities of Vienna, Leipzig and Tübingen, where he studied during the years 1879-85, the classical languages and antiquities of India and Iran. He was a pupil of Professor Johann Georg Bühler among other well known Orientalists in Germany at the time. After taking his Doctorate of Philosophy in 1883, he came to England and carried on research work at Oxford and London on old Persian philosophy and early Indian history during the years 1885-87. Later he carried on further researches in Oriental languages before coming to India in 1888 when he was appointed both the Principal of the Oriental College at Lahore and the Registrar of the Panjab University, which combined post he held for eleven years, up to 1899. It was during this period that Stein visited the valley of Kashmir with a view to obtain possession of the valuable Codex Archetipus of the *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, a chronicle of the rulers of Kashmir written by the Kashmirian Pandit Kalhaṇa in 1148. This valuable manuscript, which was undoubtedly copied in the latter half of the seventeenth century by the Kashmirian scholar Ratna Kaṇṭha, formed the basis of Stein's accredited edition of this most valuable work. This particular manuscript also contained marginal notes on the details of the topography of Kashmir in addition to various readings and corrections made by four different hands. He was not, however, satisfied with producing the first trustworthy edition of this work, but later on published,

in two volumes, a translation of the whole work in addition to a very critical study of the chronology of the rulers of Kashmir and detailed notes on the text as well as the topography of the valley of Kashmir, in the study of which the marginal notes in his manuscript as well as his repeated visits to Kashmir in the course of several years were a very valuable help.

While at Lahore, in January 1898, Stein undertook an archaeological tour with the Buner Field Forces under the command of General Blood and explored the archaeological sites in the Buner area which formed a part of the ancient country of Udyāna. During one of his visits to Kashmir, Stein also catalogued 5000 Sanskrit manuscripts in the Raghunātha temple library at Jammu. In 1899, he joined the Indian Educational Service and went to Calcutta as the Principal of the Calcutta Madrasa. Soon after his appointment to Government service, he proceeded in 1901 on a year's journey in connection with his first long exploration tour in Chinese Turkestan on which part of Central Asia the eyes of all the archaeological students of the world were focussed at the time. The discovery of a very important birch-bark manuscript in the neighbourhood of Kucha, which came into the possession of Col. Bower when he was in Kucha, and which subsequently found its way to India, had already created a sensation among the Indologists, as this happened to be the earliest manuscript (4th century A.D.) written in an Indian script and language discovered up to that time. The earliest manuscript known before this discovery formed the isolated palm-leaves, which found their way to Japan through China and are now preserved in the Horiuji monastery in Japan. Besides this, there was a discovery in Khotan of another birch-bark manuscript written in Kharoṣṭhī characters and Indian languages, which was discovered by a French Mission sent to Tibet in 1892 under the leadership of Dutreuil de Rhins. Stein's exploration on this occasion was confined to the southern portion of Chinese Turkestan, mostly in the province of Khotan and the results of this expedition were incorporated in his two volumes of *Ancient Khotan* published at Oxford in 1907. He discovered here among other objects of antiquarian interest, hundreds of documents in Indian, Chinese and Tibetan scripts and languages which have thrown quite a new light on the civilization, prominently Indian, which flourished in ancient Turkestan from the third or fourth century to the 9th century of the Christian era. The International Archaeological Congress held in 1902 at Paris recognised the importance of Stein's expedition and this led to the foundation of a series of subsequent exploration by German, Russian and French Scholars. In 1901-02 Stein was awarded the Back

grant by the Royal Geographical Society for his geographical exploration in the Eastern portion of Lob-nor and the Kuen-luen range. In 1902 he was appointed Inspector of Schools in the Panjab and was deputed to England for the purpose of studying the scientific results of the journey undertaken on behalf of the Geographical Society and a personal narrative of this journey appeared in 1903. On his return to India in 1904, he was appointed the Inspector General of Education and Archaeological Surveyor for N. W. F. P. and Baluchistan. While holding this post Stein explored many historical and important sites located in inaccessible places across the Frontier including the most interesting site of Mahaban.

In 1906 Sir Aurel undertook, under the orders of the Government of India, his second Central Asian expedition. On this occasion he went further to the East, to Khotan, and from there right up to the Northern extremity across the Taklamakan desert. During this expedition he particularly studied the topography of the ancient routes between India and Western Asia and the Far East. The most important discovery of this exploration was made by Stein in the district of Tun-huang. Here he found the western portion of the famous Chinese wall which was built in ancient times as a defence against the invasion of the Huns. But the most astounding discovery made by him was a series of artificial caves containing about 500 cells of various dimensions, which are popularly known to-day as the caves of the Thousand Buddhas. One of these caves which was found walled up, was opened by chance in 1900. There was found a big collection of manuscripts and hundreds of fine paintings on silk which had been hidden away in the eleventh century together with other relics and kept safe from the hands of enemies till chance discovery brought them to light once again. The manuscripts were examined and collected partly by Sir Aurel Stein and partly by M. Pelliot, the French Sinologist, who visited Turkestan in 1906-8, the rest being taken to Peking under orders of the Chinese Government. Results of this exploration have been embodied by Sir Aurel in the five magnificent volumes of *Serindia* published in 1921.

In order to undertake more detailed explorations of the sites already casually visited or altogether left out during his expedition of 1906, and also with a view to extend his explorations further to the East and North, Sir Aurel undertook a third expedition to Central Asia in the summer of 1913. On this occasion he started from the south and proceeded eastward as far as Kan-chou, visiting on his way the sites of antiquarian interest in the neighbourhood of Khotan, Niya and Tun-huang. He then crossed the desert of Pei Shan from

south-east to north-west, and on his way to Kashgar examined the sites of Idikut Shahri, the ancient capital of Turfan in the 7th and 8th centuries A. D., and also Lou-lan, Kucha, Akshu, among other similar sites, which were already visited but not carefully examined by German scholars. In July 1915 his journey led him across the Russian Pamirs and the mountains to the north of the Oxus and on his return journey to India he visited Samarkand, Khorasan and a portion of Seistan, the ancient Śakasthāna or the land of the Śakas. In this last-mentioned place he discovered on a rocky hill, the remains of a large Buddhist sanctuary, the first of its kind traced in Iranian soil. Here, behind later masonry, he found fresco-paintings of a later period and also some wall paintings in Hellenistic style. The details of this expedition have already appeared in the four volumes of *Innermost Asia* published in 1928 which is the last monumental work of Sir Aurel on his Central Asian expeditions. Before Sir Aurel undertook his third Central Asian tour, his services were transferred to the Archaeological Survey in 1910. After joining the Archaeological Department till his retirement in 1929, he was actively connected with various expeditions which he undertook on behalf of the Department not only in Central Asia and Persia as mentioned above, but also in other countries in the neighbourhood of India, which were at one time or the other the seat of Indian culture. But his zeal for exploration did not cease with his retirement. On the other hand, he spent all his spare time in visiting some part of the country or other and on many occasions at his own expense. Between the years 1926-28 when he was still in the Department, he had undertaken exploration tours in Upper Swat, Baluchistan and Makran, and later on in 1932-33 in South Persia and in 1935-36 in Western Iran. In response to his valuable services in exploration, honours were showered on him by various learned societies in Europe. He was awarded the gold medal of the Royal Geographical Society in 1909 and also the Petrie Medal in 1928. He was the recipient of the Royal Asiatic Society's Gold Medal in 1932, Huxley Medal in 1934 and the Gold Medal of the Society of Antiquaries in 1935. In 1910 the British Government conferred the title of C. I. E. on him and two years later he was made a K. C. I. E.

Even during the last few years of his life Sir Aurel was as actively engaged in exploration tours as he was during his early years. A few years ago he had another journey from the coast of the Arabian Sea up to the hill ranges of the north-east extremity of Makran. In 1941 and 1942 when he was in his eightieth year, he carried out an exploration tour along the dry bed of the Ghaggar or Hakra, the

ancient river Sarasvatī of the Vedic texts, in the deserts of Bikaner and Bahawalpur States. In course of this tour he traversed a distance of nearly 300 miles and discovered a large number of new sites dating from the chalcolithic to the Kushan period. From careful topographical observations Sir Aurel was able to trace another dry bed of a river, which was once a branch of the Sutlej which joined the bed of Hakra a little above the Fort Abbas near the border of Bahawalpur State. As traces of chalcolithic sites were found only below this junction, Sir Aurel was of opinion that the prehistoric occupation had been abandoned when this branch of the Sutlej which carried abundant water from the great snow-fed river to the Ghaggar had ceased to flow towards the close of the chalcolithic period. These researches have a direct bearing also on the problem of desiccation in Asia which has its wider interest for students of both history and geography. In addition to this important exploration, Sir Aurel undertook several shorter ones in the Gilgit area where he found a number of Buddhist sites containing inscriptions and figures of Buddhas and Bodhisattvas carved on rocks and also several important inscriptions which for the first time showed that this part was under a branch of the ancient Shahi rulers of Kabul. All his researches in this connection were to be published in the *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India* and though he had submitted part of his manuscripts for publication, its printing had to be stopped as a measure of paper economy and he could not live to see these volumes through the press. It is hoped that the Archaeological Department will be in a position to issue them as soon as conditions become more favourable. He did not also live to see another of his monumental works—his portfolio on the mural paintings in the Central Asian Antiquities Museum which is already in an advanced stage of printing. From the time when Sir Aurel was a comparatively young man it was his ambition to do some sound Archaeological work in Afghanistan. This chance at last came to him, but fate decided otherwise. In a letter to Mr. C. E. A. W. Oldham which he wrote from Srinagar and an extract from which has recently been published in the *Geographical Journal*, Sir Aurel wrote: "I am just about to start for a preliminary visit to Kabul, in the hope of securing the chance desired since my boyhood for work in Ariana Antiqua. Approval from New Delhi has been received for this fresh attempt, initiated by a Harvard friend, now U. S. minister at Kabul. How it will succeed the gods of Kapisa might know." But alas the gods of Kapisa desired otherwise! They apparently did not want to part with a scholar whose ambition was to visit them for years, once he

was in their territory. On the 26th of October 1943 he passed away peacefully in the house of Mr. Cornelius van H. Engert and was buried in the Christian Cemetery at Kabul on October 29.

Sir Aurel Stein could talk Persian, Pushto, Kashmiri and Sanskrit with equal fluency and made friends wherever he went, be it in the biggest society of the civilized world or among the half civilized natives of Central Asia or the frontier of India. With him passes a man who adopted archaeology as a vocation and not a profession and his life was so full of it that he preferred to remain a bachelor all his life. Nor did he, in his death, forsake his favourite archaeology for he left all that he possessed in the furtherance of its cause.

A List of Principal Publications of Sir Marc Aurel Stein

1. *Kalhaṇa's Rājatarāṅgiṇī*—Translated with an Introduction, Commentary and Appendices. Vols. I-II. 1900.
2. *Preliminary Report on a Journey of Archaeological and Topographical Exploration in Chinese Turkestan*, London, 1901.
3. *Sand-Buried Ruins of Khotan*—Personal narrative of a Journey of archaeological and geographical exploration in Chinese Turkestan, 1903.
4. *Ancient Khotan*—Detailed Report of Archaeological Explorations in Chinese Turkestan, Vols. I—II Oxford, 1907.
5. *Ruins of Desert Cathay*—Personal narrative of explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China. With illustrations etc. Vols. I & II, London, 1912.
6. *Third Journey of Exploration in Central Asia*, 1913-16. 1917.
7. *Serindia*, being a detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia and Westernmost China, carried out and described under the orders of H.M.'s Indian Government. 5 volumes, Oxford 1921.
8. *The Thousand Buddhas*, being a description of ancient Buddhist Paintings from the Cave temples of Tun-Huang on the Western Frontier of China, with an introductory essay by Laurence Binyon. 2 vols. Text and Plates. 1921.
9. *Memoir on maps of Chinese Turkestan and Kansu*, from the surveys made during Sir Aurel Stein's explorations 1900-1901, 1906-1908, 1913-15, with appendices by Major K. Mason and Dr. J. De Graff Hunter. Vols. I and II. Text and Maps. Dehra Dun. 1923.
10. *Innermost Asia*—Detailed Report of Explorations in Central Asia, Kansu and Eastern Iran. Vols. I-IV. Oxford, 1928.
11. *Archaeological Tour in Waziristan and Northern Baluchistan*. 1929 (Memoirs, A.S.I. No. 37).

12. *An Archaeological Tour in Upper Swat and Adjacent Hill Tracts*. 1930 (Memoirs, A.S.I. No. 42).
13. *An Archaeological Tour in Gedrosia*. 1931 (Memoirs, A.S.I. No. 43).
14. *Old Routes of Western Iran*, (Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1940).
15. *Zur Geschichte der Čāhis von Kabul*, Stuttgart, 1893.
16. *Detailed Report on an Archaeological Tour with the Buner Field Force*, 1898. (*Ind. Ant.*, Vol. XXVIII).
17. Notes on New Inscriptions discovered by Major Deane (Reprint from the *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. LXVII, Pt. I, No. 1, 1898),
18. *Report of the Archaeological Survey work in the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan for the period from January 2nd 1904 to March 31st 1905. 1905 & 1911-12.*
19. *Mountain Panoramas from the Pamirs and Kwen Lun*, London, 1908.
20. Explorations in Central Asia 1906-8 (Reprint from *Geographical Journal* for July and September 1909),
21. Expedition in Central Asia, 1915 (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, October 1915).
22. Desert crossing of Heuan-Tsang 630 A.D. 1919 (Reprint from *Geographical Journal* for November 1919; also *Ind. Ant.*, Vol. 4).
23. Marco Polo's Account of a Mongol inroad into Kashmir, 1919. (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal* for Aug. 1919).
24. Explorations in the Lop Desert. (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal* for Jan. 1920).
25. *Hatim's Tales*—Kashmiri stories and songs recorded with the assistance of Pandit Govind Kaul by Sir Aurel Stein. 1923.
26. *Innermost Asia—Its Geography as a Factor in History* (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal* for May and June 1925).
27. Alexander's Campaign on the Indian North-West Frontier (Reprint from *Geographical Journal* for Nov. and December 1927).
28. *On Alexander's Track to the Indus—Personal Narrative of Explorations on the North-West Frontier of India*. 1929.
29. *On Ancient Central Asian tracks*, London, 1933.
30. A Survey of Ancient sites along the "lost" Sarasvati River (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. XCIX, No. 4, April 1942).
31. *On Alexander's route into Gedrosia : An Archaeological tour in Las Bela* (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. CII, Nos. 5,6, Nov.-Dec. 1943).

32. *Old routes of Western Iran*. Narrative of an Archaeological journey carried out and recorded, antiquities examined, described and illustrated with the assistance of Fred. H. Andrews, London, 1940.
33. An archaeological tour in Ancient Persia (Reprint from *Iraq*, Vol. III, No. 2).
34. Notes on Alexander's crossing of the Tigris and the Battle of Arbela (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. C, No. 4 Oct. 1942).
35. Surveys on the Roman Frontier in Iraq and Trans-Jordan (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. XCV, No. 6 June 1940).
36. Note on Remains of the Roman lines in North-Western Iraq (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. XCII, No. 1 July 1938).
37. The Ancient Trade routes past Hatra and its Roman posts (Reprint from the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, Oct. 1941).
38. Zoroastrian Deities on Indo-Sythian coins (Reprint from the *Oriental and Babylonian Record*, August 1887. London 1887).
39. Zoroastrian Deities on Indo-Sythian coins (Reprint from the *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XVII, pt. CCVII with plates. Bombay 1888).
40. An Archaeological Journey in Western Iran (Reprint from the *Geographical Journal*, Vol. XCII, No. 4, Oct. 1938).
41. *Archaeological reconnaissances in North-Western India and South-Eastern Iran with illustrations, plates of antiques, plans and maps from original surveys*, London, 1937.
42. Collection of Tibetan Documents from Chinese Turkestan. Notes by A. H. Francke (Reprint from the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* for Jan. 1914).
43. *Memoir of Maps illustrating the Ancient Geography of Kashmir*. (*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Extra No. 2 for 1899.)
44. *On Ancient tracks past the Pamirs* (Reprint from the *Himalayan Journal*, Vol. IV, 1932).
45. *Kashmiri-English Dictionary*, 2 Vols.
46. *Notes on the life and Labours of Captain Anthony Troyer* (Reprint from the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bengal, Letters*, Vol. VI, No. 1, 1940).
47. In memoriam-Pandit Kaul (Reprint from the preface to *Hatim's Tales—Kashmir Stories and Songs*, London, 1923).
48. *The Castle of Lohara* (*Indian Antiquary*, Vol. XXVI).

49. *Preliminary Note on an Archaeological Tour on the Indus, (Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXX).*
50. *Notes on an Archaeological Tour in South Bihar and Hazaribagh. Indian Antiquary, Vol. XXX (1901).*
51. *Archaeological Notes during Explorations in Central Asia in 1906-08. (with preface by Editor) Indian Antiquary, Vols. XXXVIII and XXXIX.*
52. *A Third Journey of Exploration in Central Asia, 1913-16 Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLVI.*
53. *Excavations at Sahri Bahlol—Annual Report, Archaeological Survey of India, 1911-12*
54. *Exploration of the Mahaban range Ibid 1904-05*
55. *Identification of Parihāsapura. „ 1915-16*
56. *A Note on Avantipura „ 1913-14*
57. *A Note on Aornos Rock. „ 1904-05
and 1924-25*
58. *A Note on Baijnath Temple. „ 1905-06*
59. *A Note on Kashmir monuments. „ 1915-16*
60. *A Note on Mount Banj. „ 1904-05*
61. *A Note on Rajagriha. „ 1905-06*
62. *For Reports as Officer on Special Duty in the Archaeological Department see Annual Reports, Archaeological Survey of India 1921-28.*
63. *Notes on Inscriptions from Udyāna presented by Major Deane. J. R. A. S., 1898.*
64. *Sanskrit Deed of Sale concerning a Kashmirian Mahābhārata Ms., J. R. A. S., 1900.*
65. *Notes on a Journey from Hunza, J. R. A. S. 1901.*
66. *On Colonel Deane's Inscribed Stones from Swat. J. R. A. S. 1903.*
67. *Early Judaeo-Persian Document from Khotan, J. R. A. S., 1903.*

The Colophon of the Jātaka-stava

By H. W. BAILEY

We are indebted to Sir M. Aurel Stein for so many discoveries concerning the history of Chinese Turkestan and I have myself been so fortunate in working at the Khotanese manuscripts of his collection that I am pleased indeed to offer a small tribute to his memory and can only regret that the present time has divorced me from my books and hence reduced the offering to so little.

Among the many manuscripts that we owe to Sir Aurel Stein is one containing the text of the Khotanese Jātaka-stava. A facsimile of this manuscript has been published in *Codices Khotanenses* (Copenhagen, 1938). The introductory verses dedicate the poem to the Khotanese king Śrī Viśa Śūra. The following note refers only to the colophon which is found on folio 39 written in cursive Brāhmī script. This reads as follows:—

ttū Jāttaka-stavā biysūñām dāṣkarā kīrām hīvī agā
cā kimāśanā pasta piḍai biysūstā brrīyī
tṭye pūñā kūśalā-mūla pārrjsai jsa cakavattai śai tcūnā aṇiscyā
rāsā gavu ga-vaśiṣa hamāvā upatta-vaśesa sthānā-viśaiṣa
haiysdi vīra jsā viśārā rāsā rādā bviysye jsīñā prrīyāgā
hamāvi: maiscyi aṇescyānā bvaiysa jsīna hamāvi kalpa
jsa hajsaiḍe karma biṣdi jādi biśa pīrmāttama ttā baiysuṣṭī
paridi vyechai
tt<ū>ṣtām pūñā padā śānā pyarā pūhyā cā pina jsa habrrihū
gavi vasasīdā: mira hūmām bveysa-jsīnā hamāvā
tt<ū>ṣ<ṭām>pūñā pyarā hiye paysāvyē brrāvāra cā ttaiha
tcainā kharūṣa jsa habrrihu u pūrā dvarā jsa
ttu ṣtām pūñā naira kiṃa-hva jsa habrrihū u dvīra rūpājīva jsa:
dvīrā jvālakya jsa brrāvāra ttravilai sīdyavarra jsa ttravī-
lai darmajñā jsa
harbiśām aśīrya gāthā vajrrayaunyām jsa biśā satva biysūstāṣṭā
vyārṇa byehidā
aysa ttā cā [ca] kimāśanā byehīme thyau madṛtām sijāṣṭā
baiysūstā vyichīme Kymśan
paysāvyē hvārakya sūrai maitra jsa

Translation

"This Jātaka-stava is a book (*anga*) of the difficult feats of the Buddha. Ṭṣang Kim-śan ordered to write (or: condescended to write)

for love of Bodhi. In reliance upon the merit of this favourable root, may the Emperor Śing-tsun possess the position of endless lordship and a peculiar position, a peculiar rebirth and a peculiar station. At the present time may the king of the Vajra kingdom enjoy long life. May he be mighty, endless and long-lived. May all the deeds accumulated through the age disappear. May he condescend to attain the supreme Bodhi.

This same merit I share with.....my father...Tṣang Pin. May his states of life be purified. May my mother Hūmām be long-lived.

This same merit I share with my father's own brother Tṣang Tig-tsin and with sons and daughters.

This same merit I share with my wife Kim-hva, with my daughter Rūpājiva, with my daughter Jvālakya, with my brother the knower of three Piṭakas Sidhyavardhana, with my brother the knower of the three Piṭakas Dharmajñāna, with all teachers and householders of the Vajrayāna. May all beings attain to Bodhi according to prophecy.

May I, therefore, Tṣang Kim-śan, attain swiftly to the learning of the formulæ (*mantra*). May I realise Bodhi. Kim-san.

With my own sister Sūrai-maitra."

A few brief notes will justify this translation. The name of the owner of the manuscript Cā Kīmāśanā, that is, Tṣang Kim-śan, tells us that we are concerned with a member of the distinguished Tṣang family which during most of the T'ang period supplied hereditary governors to the region of Śa-tsou. The full name is preserved in a Chinese Text (Stein MS, Ch. I.0021a) as 張金山 Tṣang Kin-šan (older *t'iang kī-m-šan*, Karlgren, *Analytic Dictionary*, 1174, 386, 849), from which we learn also that he was the ambassador of Yu-tien (Khotan). His name appears in the last line of the colophon, most unexpectedly, in Sogdian script as Kym-san, and can be seen again in Sogdian script on the end of folio 156 of the Siddha-sāra (facsimile in *Codices Khotanenses*). The same name has also been noticed elsewhere in Khotanese manuscripts. His relationship to the present colophon is expressed by the ambiguous phrase *pasta pīḍai*: the verb *parrud-* means either 'to order' or 'to condescend.'

The merit of writing the Jātaka-stava is then shared with the king, his own family and the teachers and laity of the Buddhist Vajrayāna sect. The king, who is styled Cakravartī or emperor, is given a Chinese epithet *śai tcūnā* which probably corresponds to the Chinese Buddhist 聖尊 *ś'ng-tsun* 'sacred and revered' (from older *śiāng-tsuān*, Karlgren, *loc. cit.* 1205, 1112). This epithet is used elsewhere (see *BSOAS*. 9. 541) of the Khotanese king Viśa Darma. The names of his family come next. Cā is Tṣang. The

mother's name Hūmāṃ has not been identified. The uncle's name Kharūṣa occurs in other Khotanese texts, as in the Staël-Holstein roll 40, 47 (where the editor read wrongly *dū, du* for *rū*). The wife's name Kim-hva is clearly Chinese Kin-xua 'golden Flower' (from older *ki²m·x"á*, Karlgren, *loc. cit.* 386,94). The daughter's name Rūpājiva is Indian and is evidently used here in no pejorative sense. The second daughter's name Jvālakya 'Brilliant' is also Indian, but the suffix-*kya* is likely to be Khotanese. The two brothers have Indian names and both are Tripiṭakas (*ttravīlai* from a middle Indian **triviḍaa-*). The ācāryas and gṛhasthas belong to the Vajrayāna (*vajrayāniḥa-*), which is familiar also in other Khotanese texts. The sister Sūraimaitra was evidently overlooked and her name inserted later.

The term *Agisāla* in two Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions

BY T. BURROW

In the ruins of Shāh-jī-ki-Dherī, which have been identified as the remains of the *stūpa* and *vihāra* of Kanishka, a metal relic casket bearing a Kharoṣṭhī inscription was unearthed during excavations in the year 1909. The inscription was edited with photographs by Spooner¹ and Marshall², and appears as no. lxxii in Sten Konow's edition of the *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions*.³ In this inscription there occurs a word *agisāla* which was interpreted by the original editors as a rendering in Kharoṣṭhī letters of the Greek proper name Agesilaos. In this Konow follows them without any question, as also do general writers on Indian history⁴, as a result of which 'Agesilaos' has become established as a minor historical figure. Nevertheless in spite of this practical unanimity, the grounds for finding the Greek name Agesilaos in this inscription are the slenderest possible, and the reasons for not accepting the theory are so strong that a serious examination of the facts leads with practical certainty to its rejection. It is the purpose of this short article to state briefly the arguments against the current theory, with the hope that 'Agesilaos' may finally be disposed of.

There are two conditions essential if we are going to read a Greek name in an Indian inscription; firstly that it should be rendered with reasonable accuracy in the Indian alphabet, and secondly that there should not be some more obvious Indian interpretation at hand. There are cases where these conditions are fulfilled. Well-known examples to which reference can be made are Heliudora of the Besnagar pillar inscription⁵ and Theudora of the Swat relic vase inscription.⁶ In the latter case there is further confirmation in the fact that Theudora has the Greek title Meridarch. Quite different is the case with *agisāla*. This is not the way one would expect the name Agesilaos

1 *ASIAR.*, 1909—10, pp. 135 ff.

2 *JRAS.*, 1909, pp. 105b ff.

3 *CII.*, vol. II, pt. i, pp. 135ff.

4 V. A. Smith, *Early History of India*,⁴ p. 277, referring to "the celebrated relic casket bearing an image and inscription of Kanishka, whose superintending engineer had the Greek name of Agesilaos"; L. de la Vallée Poussin, *L'Inde aux Temps des Mauryas et des Barbares*, p. 258, W. W. Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India*, pp. 355, 392.

5 Marshall, *JRAS.*, 1909, pp. 1053ff.

6 Konow, *CII.*, II, i 1ff.

to be represented. In the first place the -g-, as Konow observes, is 'devoid of the usual otiose r- stroke'. This 'r- stroke' is indicative of a fricative pronunciation of single intervocalic g and in such cases the transliteration -ḡ- is more convenient than Konow's -g(r)-. Its absence quite certainly indicates -gg- which was not of course fricatised, and for that reason it is possible to distinguish original -g- from -gg- in Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, even though the alphabet does not write double consonants. This being the case there is no force in Konow's suggestion⁷ that this way of writing indicates a foreign name. Single g of whatever origin was pronounced as a fricative and as such represented in writing; in the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Central Asia there are foreign names in plenty, but we always find in such cases single intervocalic g rendered as fricative (ḡ-). Another objection is the following consonant—the palatal -ś-. If the Greek name Agesilaos were being represented, there is no reason why the dental -s- corresponding to the Greek should not have been used. Finally the vowels do not correspond very well. It would have been just as easy in Kharoṣṭhī to write aḡesiḷ-, as aḡiṣaḷ-, if it had been a question of rendering that name.

Turning to the second point, we find even stronger reasons for disbelieving that *aḡiṣala* is a rendering of a Greek name. In his edition of the text⁸ Marshall remarks: "The name Aḡiṣala is certainly non-Indian". Foucher¹⁰ is not quite so certain. According to him *aḡiṣala* could represent Skt. *Agniśāla*- which he renders 'one who possesses a temple of fire'. This however he regards as a corruption due to popular etymology of the original Greek name. He then proceeds to defend the theory with a completely illogical argument. "Pour nous refuser à admettre une interprétation aussi simple, il faudrait rejeter en bloc non seulement toutes les transcriptions indiennes de mots grecs que nous donnent les textes classiques et le légendes des monnaies, mais encore l' Heliodore, fils de Diya (Dion), de l'inscription de Besnagar et le Thaidora (Théodore) fils de Datis de celle de Koldarra". It does not of course follow, if the explanation of *aḡiṣala* by 'Agesilaos' is to be rejected, that all other Greek names in Indian sources are also to be rejected.

In speaking of *Agniśāla* Foucher practically gives the game away, except that he still wants to see in the word a proper name. Such a name is unlikely and the most natural interpretation of *aḡiṣala*

⁷ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

⁸ *Ib.*, p. 135.

⁹ *JRAS.*, 1909, p. 1058.

¹⁰ *L'Art Greco-bouddhique du Gandhāra*, II, p. 532.

appearing in a Kharoṣṭhī document is that it corresponds to Skt. *agnisālā*, Pa. *aggisālā* 'a hall of fire'. Bearing in mind the fact that -g- (instead of -ḡ-, -g(r)-) represents -gg-, such a conclusion is difficult to avoid, and it is difficult to see what else the original users of Kharoṣṭhī could have made of it. The *agisala* has of course nothing to do with a 'fire-temple' as Foucher seems to think, but was a recognised part of a Buddhist monastery. In the Pali texts *aggisālā* which the Pali Text Society's Dictionary renders 'a heated hall or refectory' is mentioned as such an established institution in the *Vinaya-piṭaka*¹¹ and other works.

That being the case, it is not surprising to find mention of it in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions which are of predominantly Buddhist content. As it happens, another Kharoṣṭhī inscription has recently turned up in which the same word is found. This is on a stone lamp found by Barger and Wright during their journey of exploration in the Swat Valley in 1938, and now preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. In the publication dealing with the finds of this expedition¹², this inscription is listed and a tentative transcription given:—

Sagami caudiṣami [gaḍda?] agisala [e goḥ so?]

Although not completely legible, the purport of this inscription is quite clear. It is a statement that the lamp belongs to the community of Buddhist monks ("the Saṃgha of the Four Quarters") and further specifies that it is kept in the fire-hall of the monastery (*agisalae* Loc. S.). In view of the obviousness of this interpretation, it is unlikely that anyone will want to read the name 'Agesilaos' into this text, and it would be quite arbitrary and inconsistent to understand *agisala* as representing Skt. *agnisālā* in one text, and in the other text a foreign name.

The interpretation of *agisala* given here necessitates a re-examination of the passage in the Kaniṣka casket inscription in which it occurs. This passage occurs at the base of the casket and runs as follows:

dasa agisala navakarmi kanesṣkasa vihare Mahasenasa saṃgharame

It seems that through haplography *navakarmi Kanesṣkasa* has been written for *navakarmi <ka> Kanesṣkasa*. Under the assumption that *agisala* meant 'Agesilaos' this has been translated: "The slave Agesilaos, the Superintendent of works at the vihāra of Kaniṣka in the monastery of Mahasena". Since, however, for the reasons

11 *Vinaya-Piṭaka*, II, 154, 210 etc.

12 *Excavations in Swat and Explorations in the Orus territories of Afghanistan*, p. 60 (MAS. no. 64)

given above, there is no adequate basis for the rendering 'Agesilaos', a different translation must be given. Interpreting *agiśala* as Skt. *agnīśālā*, we can construe without difficulty the phrase *agiśala nava-karmi* <*ka*>, since a reference to the repairing or rebuilding of an *agnīśālā* is one that we might expect to come across in a Kharoṣṭhī inscription dealing with a Buddhist monastery. This interpretation leaves the sentence without a proper name, and there is no compelling to believe that it should have contained one, especially if we interpret *dasa* at the beginning of the sentence not as a singular, but as a plural. This we almost certainly should do, since the regular form of the nominative singular in these inscriptions is either -o or -e. Such a form of the nominative singular is found in this inscription in *deyadharme* of the preceding line. That being the case, the whole sentence should be translated: "The slaves who rebuilt the *agnīśālā* in the vihāra of Kaniṣka, in the monastery of Mahāsena."

A final note is necessary on the word *nava-karmika*. This means properly 'renewer, repairer, rebuilder', and not merely 'architect' in general. This has an important bearing on the date of the casket, since a reference to the rebuilding of a portion of Kaniṣka's vihāra suggests that it had been in existence for some time—long enough in fact for parts of it to have fallen into disrepair. If this is the case, the casket may well be dated something like a hundred years after Kaniṣka, and not, as is generally assumed, be contemporaneous with his reign.

Negapatam and Theravāda Buddhism in South India

BY DR. S. PARANAVITANA

The two Leiden grants¹ of the Coḷa Emperors Rājārāja I and Kulotunga I respectively, are well-known to students of Indian history and antiquities. From these two documents we learn that, in the eleventh century, Buddhism still had its adherents at the port of Negapatam on the south-eastern sea-board of India, and that the followers of this faith in Further India took an interest in building shrines at that place and making endowments for their maintenance. The remains of the Cūḍāmaṇivarma-vihāra of Negapatam, built by the Śailendra king of Kaṭāha and Śrīviṣaya, as recorded in the larger Leiden grant, were preserved as late as 1867 and might be still standing, had their historical significance been appreciated then as it would be now.² A large number of Buddhist bronzes, many of them inscribed, were discovered at Negapatam some years ago, indicating the existence of a considerable Buddhist population at this place at the date to which these bronzes can be ascribed, i.e. about the 11th or 12th century. Tamil literature has also preserved evidence of the connection of Buddhists with Negapatam. Mr K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar, the learned editor of the Leiden plates, states:³ "In the traditional account of Tirumaṅgani-Ālvār, who is described in the *Guruparamparā* as a feudatory of the Coḷa king of his day, it is stated that he once went to Nāgapattanam, got inside the Buddhist temple at the place, carried away the gold image that was enshrined within it and melting the same, utilised the amount in building walls and other structures in the Raṅganātha temple at Śrīraṅgam. If there is any truth in this, it would show that long prior to the construction of Cūḍāmaṇivarma-vihāra, i.e. before the beginning of the 9th century, Negapatam was renowned as a Buddhist centre and had in it a Bauddha monument. We do not know if the *vihāra* that was erected in the days of Rājārāja I was a new one or was only the renewal of the old monument."

The Pali literature of Ceylon has preserved some references to Negapatam which prove that the connection of Buddhism with that

1 Edited by K. V. Subrahmanya Aiyar in *Epigraphia Indica*, Vol. XXII, pp. 213-281.

2 For the circumstances in which these Buddhist remains were demolished, see *Indian Antiquary*, Vol. VII, p. 224.

3 *Ep. Ind.*, Vol. XXII, pp. 230-31.

port goes back to a very early date and that the place remained a centre of Buddhist activities when that religion had ceased to count adherents in many other parts of the Tamil land where it was once flourishing. These references, which, so far as my knowledge goes, have not received the attention of students of Indian history, may be of some interest to readers of this Journal.

The *Saddhamma-saṅgaha*, in its account of the life and activities of Buddhaghosa, the greatest of Pali commentators, states that it was from Nāgapaṭṭana that he took ship to come to the island of Ceylon from India.⁴ According to Ceylon tradition, Buddhaghosa was a native of North India, and after his conversion to Buddhism, he was entrusted by his teacher with the task of translating into Pali the exegetical literature which then existed in the Sinhalese language. The account of Buddhaghosa and his literary activities given in the *Saddhamma-saṅgaha* agrees in the main with that of the *Mahāvamsa* (Chap. 37, vv. 215-246) but gives additional details. The author of the *Saddhamma-saṅgaha*, Dhammakitti, was a native of Siam, but he received his ordination in Ceylon and studied in that island under Dhammakitti Mahāsāmi, who flourished in the middle of the fourteenth century.⁵ The statement recorded in the *Saddhamma-saṅgaha* may therefore be taken as the tradition which was current in Ceylon during the fourteenth century. The story of Buddhaghosa is full of improbabilities, but the mention of Nāgapaṭṭana as the port from which he took ship to come to this island must have been at least due to the fact that it was well-known to the Buddhists of Ceylon as a place from where religious teachers from India started on their sea-voyage to the island.

Negapatam is also connected with Dhammapāla who, as a commentator of Pali texts, occupies a place second only to that of the great Buddhaghosa. In the colophons of his numerous works, it is stated that Dhammapāla was a resident of Badaratittha-vihāra. The *Sāsana-vamsa*, which is a work produced in Burma not more than a

4 *Evam vutte āyasmā Buddhaghosoppītisomanassappatto hutvā upajjhāyam ca bhikkhu-saṅghaṇ ca vanditvā āpucchitvā anugamanena Nāgapaṭṭanam sampāpuṇi. Atha Sakko devarājā haritakīphallaṇ ca lekhanīṇ ca tassa datvā sakaṭṭhānam eva gato....Tato so nāvam abhirūhitvā etc. Journal of the Pali Text Society for 1890, p. 53.*

5 See *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, Vol. XV, pp. 39-46 and my paper 'Religious Intercourse between Ceylon and Siam in the 13th-15th centuries' in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Ceylon Branch*, Vol. XXXII, pp. 204-205.

hundred years ago, states that this Badaratittha was in the Tamil country not far from the island of Ceylon.⁶ The passage stating that Dhammapāla resided at Badaratittha, occurring at the end of manuscripts of his works, may not be Dhammapāla's own but might have been added by a later copyist. In the colophons to his works which can, without doubt, be attributed to Dhammapāla himself, there is only one reference to any place he resided in, and that occurs at the close of his commentary to the Nettippakaraṇa. Therein he refers to himself as 'residing in the Dhammāsoka-mahārāja-vihāra at Nāga-paṭṭana, the place where the Good Law crossed over (*saddhammāvataratthāna*).⁷

The date of the Pali commentator Dhammapāla is not definitely known, but most Pali scholars are inclined to believe that he flourished not long after Buddhaghosa, that is to say, about the sixth century. Rhys Davids' identification of this Pali commentator with the Dharmapāla of Kāñcī, mentioned by Hieun Tsiang, is open to grave doubts and he may have flourished at a date considerably later than that to which he is ascribed by a consensus of opinion among Pali scholars. However this may be, Dhammapāla's connection with Negapatam is beyond doubt. It is also interesting to note that the vihāra at Negapatam wherein Dhammapāla resided, was named after the great Buddhist emperor Aśoka. The name was probably due to the belief of the local Buddhists that Aśoka himself was instrumental in the introduction of Buddhism to the country round Negapatam. It may even be that the faithful of the place ascribed the foundation of this religious establishment to the great Buddhist emperor.⁸

The epithet *saddhammāvataratthāna* applied to Negapatam is highly significant. It was most probably due to the fact that Buddhist missionaries who left the shores of India to propagate the faith abroad took ship at this sea-port. The geographical position of Negapatam must have made it take a great part in the commercial and cultural intercourse which developed in ancient times between South India and the countries of Further India and the Indonesian islands. The

6 *Sāsanavaṃsa*, P.T.S. Edition, p. 33.

7 *Saddhammāvataratthāne paṭṭane Nāga-savhaye*

Dhammāsoka-mahārāja-vihāre vasatā mayā.

The *Nettippakaraṇa* with extracts from Dhammapāla's Commentary, edited by E. Hardy, P.T.S. London, 1902, p. 249.

8 Hieun Tsiang, in his account of South Indian lands, mentions a number of places which had *stūpas* ascribed to Aśoka, See Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. 11, pp. 227, 230 and 231.

barks which left this port laden with merchandise must have frequently carried Buddhist teachers whose names are now forgotten, but who doubtless played a great part in the diffusion of Indian culture and religion throughout the countries of Eastern Asia. The statement in the *Saddhammasaṅgaha* that Buddhaghosa started from Negapatam on his journey to Ceylon thus becomes highly probable.⁹ It also would explain why the Buddhist rulers of Kaṭāha took such pains to erect and endow shrines at Negapatam. Possibly they considered that the introduction of Buddhism into their country was due to the activities of religious teachers who went there from Negapatam and the place was accordingly held in veneration.

The Pali literature of Ceylon throws some light on the subsequent history of the Cūḍāmaṇi-varma-vihāra built at Negapatam by the Śailendra king. At the end of the Pali grammar *Rūpasiddhi*, its author, Buddhappiya, has included a stanza in which he gives us information about himself. In it Buddhappiya tells us that he was also known as Dīpaṅkara, that his teacher was the famous Ānandathera, like unto a banner in Tambapaṇṇi (Ceylon), that he gained renown as the light of the Tamil land and that he caused the religion (of the Buddha) to shine fourth by being the superior of two monastic establishments, one of which was called Bālādicca (Skt. Bālāditya).¹⁰ The Sinhalese interverbal paraphrase of the *Rūpasiddhi*, which seems to have been written not long after the time of Buddhappiya—it is quoted as an authority in a work of the 15th century—supplies the name of the other monastery over which Buddhappiya presided. In the printed edition of this text, as well as in the manuscripts, the name of this *vihāra* is given as Cūḍāmaṇikarma.¹¹ This is clearly a scribal error, for “Cūḍmaṇikarma” is meaningless as the name of a *vihāra*. As Buddhappiya’s connection with the Tamil country is testified to by himself in the *Rūpasiddhi* and as he is often given the

9 Hsuen Tsiang and I-tsing seem to refer to Nāgapaṭṭanam as the place of embarkation from South India to Ceylon, See Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, Vol. II, p. 233, n.

10 *Vikhyātānanda-theravagga-vara-gurunaṃ Tambapaṇṇiddhajānaṃ Sisso Dīpaṅkarākhyo Damaḷa-vasumatī-dīpa-laddhappakāso Bālādiccāḍ ivāsadvitayam. adhivasam sāsanaṃ jotayai yo So’yaṃ Buddhappiyavho yati imam-ujjaṇaṃ Rūpasiddhiṃ akāsi.*

11 *Bālāditya nam vāsaya ādi-śabdayeṃ gat Cūḍāmaṇikarma (varma)-vihāraya yana me devāsuyehi veseṃin.* The *Rūpasiddhi*, with the Sinhalese paraphrase, has been edited and published in Sinhalese characters by Pandit Dehigaspe Paññāsāra, Colombo, 1927.

epithet of 'Coliya' in Ceylon writings, and as a Buddhist *vihāra* called Cuḍāmaṇi-varma is known to have existed in the Coḷa country, we can safely correct the form of this name occurring in manuscripts to Cuḍāmaṇi-varma-vihāra. The word *varma* would not have been known to the ordinary copyist in Ceylon, but the word *ḥarma* was well-known to him. The error can thus be accounted for very easily. We may therefore conclude that the second of the two monasteries of which Buddhappiya was the superior was the same as that founded by Māravijayottuṅgavarman, king of Kaṭāha and Śrīviṣaya and endowed at the request of that foreign potentate by the Coḷa emperor Rājārāja I, and later by Kulottuṅga—Coḷa I. Neither the *Rūpasiddhi* nor its Sinhalese gloss has any reference to Negapatam, and we are therefore not in a position to say whether the other convent, named Bālāditya, was situated at that place. It was evidently the more important of the two establishments, for Buddhappiya made special mention of it while he left the identity of the other to be explained by his exegetist. Like the Cūḍāmaṇivarma Vihāra and Dhammāsoka Vihāra of Negapatam, Bālādicca Vihāra, too, appears to have been named after an important personage. The most famous Bālāditya of Buddhist history was the king of Magadha who, according to Hieun Tsiang, was the founder of the celebrated *vihāra* of Nālandā but we cannot assert that a monastic establishment in the Coḷa country was named after him.

The connection of Buddhappiya-thera with Negapatam seems beyond doubt. This thera occupies a position of considerable importance in the history of Theravāda Buddhism. Besides the *Rūpasiddhi*, he was also the author of a Pali poem called the *Pajjamadhu*.¹² As will be seen from what follows, he seems to have made a commendable effort to resuscitate the waning fortunes of Buddhism in South India. It will therefore be of some interest for the history of Buddhism in South India to ascertain the time during which this religious teacher flourished. The consensus of opinion among scholars in Ceylon is that Buddhappiya flourished in the thirteenth century during the reign of Parākramabāhu II.¹³ This date, however, seems to be too late by about a century.

Attention may be drawn in this connection to a passage occurring in the *Vimativinodani*,¹⁴ an exegetical work on the Vinaya written

12. Edited in the *J.P.T.S.* for 1887, pp. 1-16.

13. See Malalasekara, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, London, 1928, pp. 220ff.

14. Edited and published in Sinhalese characters by Somāloka Tissa Thera, Laksman Press, Colombo, 1935.

by another South Indian Buddhist writer, Kassapa by name. In discussing the question whether it is an offence to drink intoxicating liquor unwittingly, this author says: "In former times, a certain *thera* named Nāgasena who lived in this Tamil country and belonged to a persuasion differing (from the Theravāda), had the story of Kuṇḍalakesī done into the form of a Tamil poem,¹⁵ for the purpose of exhibiting the methods of refuting other doctrines. He instructed the poet who composed the poem and had it composed inserting in that composition various perverted views, confusing the mind with fallacious arguments, such as (1) that this act of drinking intoxicating liquors is sinful only in the case of drinking the same intentionally (2) that the knowledge of the Omniscient One is not capable of perceiving in a particularised manner the knowledgable objects, which are infinite by differences of time and space; if the knowledgable objects are limited by knowledge, it would lead to the absurdity of disavowing the infiniteness of knowledgable objects, therefore the Omniscient One is capable of knowing objects only in their general character, such as their evanescence, (3) such conventions as *puggala* (personality) etc., are separate entities like name and form, etc., in the categories of ultimates. This heretical view was introduced to the doctrines of Vibhajjavādins on account of that poem and continued to remain so for a long time. It was eradicated at a later period by the great *thera* Buddhappiya, who established the pure religion here by tearing asunder the net of false views, both external and internal. Nevertheless, certain persons of perverted mind again raised their heads relying on the statement in the explanatory work on the Vinaya, called the *Sāratthadīpanī*, that the drinking of liquor is sinful only when it is intentional".¹⁶

15 This Buddhist poem, like the *Maṇimekalai*, was included among the five *mahākāvya*s of the Tamil language. It is no longer extant and is known only from quotations in other literary works.

16. Pubbe kira imasmiṃ *Damīla-ratṭhe* koci bhinnaladdhiko Nāgaseno nāma *thero* Kuṇḍalakesi-vatthum paravāda-mathana-nayadassanattāṃ *Damīla-kabba-rūpena* karento imam surāpānassa jānitvā va pivane akusala-nayaṃ aññaṃ ca desakālādi-bhedena amantam'pi ñeyyāṃ sabbaññuta-ñānam sulakhaṇa-vasen'eva nātum na sakkoti, nāṇena paricchinna-ttena ñeyyassa amantatta-hānippasaṅgato, aniccādi-sāmañña-lakkhaṇa-vasen'eva nātum sakkoti'ti ca paramattha-dhammesu nāma-rūpaṃ'ti ādi-bhedo viya puggalādi-sommatī'pi viṣum vatthu-bhedo evā'ti ca evamādikāṃ bahum viparītattā-nayaṃ kabba-kārassa kavīno upadisitvā tasmīṃ pabandhe kāraṇābhāsehi satim sammohetvā pabandhāpesi,...Tam ca kabbaṃ nissāya imaṃ bhinna-laddhikaṃ matam

It is clear from this reference that some time before Buddhappiya's reform of the South Indian Theravāda community, the question whether it is a sin even if one tasted liquor unwittingly aroused considerable discussion among its members. Those who maintained that no sin is committed if there is no intention of drinking liquor appealed to the Tamil poem *Kuṇḍalakeśī* in support of their position. Buddhappiya condemned this view as heretical but after some time it was revived by an appeal to the authority of the *Sāratthadīpanī*. The wording of the passage in the *Vimativinodanī* suggests that the decision on this point given in the *Sāratthadīpanī* is posterior to Buddhappiya. *Sāratthadīpanī* is an extensive sub-commentary to the Vinaya written by the learned thera named Śāriputra who flourished in Ceylon during the reign of Parākramabāhu I (1153-1186). Buddhappiya Thera may therefore be taken, on the authority of the *Vimativinodanī*, to have flourished before, or contemporaneously with, Śāriputra.

It may however be argued that such an inference need not necessarily be drawn from the reference in the *Vimativinodanī*, quoted above. The *Sāratthadīpanī* might already been written before the time of Buddhappiya's reform, but the South Indian Theravādins who did not object to the taking of liquor unwittingly, might not have known it at that time and became aware of the evidence supporting their contention contained in that authority at some later date.

But there is further evidence of a decisive nature which proves that Buddhappiya flourished in the twelfth and not in the thirteenth century. The Pali grammar *Padasādhana* refers to Buddhappiya's *Rūpasiddhi* and criticises some of its views.¹⁷ The *Padasādhana* is based on the grammatical system of Moggallāna who in the *vutti* composed by himself to elucidate his own aphorisms, states that this work was composed in the reign of Parākramabāhu I.¹⁸ Moggallāna was also one of the leading members of the synod convened by Parā-

idha vibhajjavādī-mate sammissaṃ ciraṃ pavatthittha. Tam pana pacchā Acariya Buddhappiyo-mahātherena bahirubbhantarikaṃ diṭṭhijālaṃ vighāṭetvā idha parisuddhaṃ sāsanaṃ patitṭhapentena sodhitam'pi Sāratthadīpaniyyā Vinayaṭṭhikāya surāpānassa sacittakapakkhe yeva cittaṃ akusalaṃ ti samatthana-vacanaṃ nissūya kehici vipallattha-cittehi puna ukkhitta-siraṃ jātam (Vimativinodanī, op. cit., pp. 100-101)

17 *Padasādhana*, with Sinhalese paraphrase, edited by Dhammānanda Thera, Colombo 1932, p. 67.

18 James d'Alvis, *A Descriptive Catalogue of Sanskrit, Pali and Sinhalese Literary Works*, Vol. I, p. 185.

kramabāhu for the purpose of purifying and uniting the Buddhist church in Ceylon, early in his reign.¹⁹ To occupy such a position he must have been a very senior *thera* at that time. The grammarian Moggallāna (Vyāriṇi Mugalan) is referred to as a high dignitary of the Church in the Tamil inscription which the Veḷaikkāras set up at Polonnaruva some years before the accession of Parākramabāhu.²⁰

The author of the *Padasādhana*, by name Piyadassi, was a direct pupil of Moggallāna,²¹ as stated by himself in the colophon to his work. That work, therefore, must have been composed within the reign of Parākramabāhu, or a few years after his death at the latest. The *Rūpasiddhi*, quoted and criticised in the *Padasādhana*, must be earlier in date and its author Buddhappiya seems to have been a younger contemporary of Moggallāna.

Scholars who ascribe Buddhappiya to the thirteenth century do so relying mainly on their identification of his teacher Ānanda with the *thera* of that name who was a pupil of Medhaṅkara of Udumbaragiri, the hierarch who induced Parākramabāhu II (1236-1269) to re-organise the Buddhist Church in Ceylon.²² This Ānanda Thera of the thirteenth century was the author of a Sinhalese interverbal translation (*sanne*) to the *Padasādhana* in which, as we have noted above, Buddhappiya is criticised. It is, therefore, impossible that he was the teacher of Buddhappiya.

In this connection, an inscription of Sundaramahādevī, queen of Vikramabāhu I (1116-1137), found at Polonnaruva,²³ merits consideration. The record is too fragmentary for us to decide what its purport was, but it opens with a Pali stanza eulogising a *thera* named Ānanda. The inscription praises Ānanda as a person of high spiritual attainments, calls him a banner raised aloft in the land of Laṅkā and informs us that he was instrumental in the establishment of the Buddhist religion in the Coḷa country besides having had contacts with the *saṅgha* of the Tambaraṭṭha.²⁴ Buddhappiya, in referring to his teacher calls him a 'banner unto the island of Ceylon' almost the

19 *Mahāvamsa*, Chap. 78, v. 9 and *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. II, p. 249.

20 *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. II, p. 249 ff.

21 *Padasādhana*, *op. cit.*, pp. 301-302.

22 Malalasekara, *The Pali Literature of Ceylon*, p. 211.

23 *Epigraphia Zeylanica*, Vol. IV, pp. 67-72.

24 *Āṇandu-nāma-vidīto jayatiḍḍhipatto*

Laṅkā-talussita-dhajo pavaro yatiso

Yo Tambaraṭṭhayaṭi...thera-bhūto

Coḷesu sāṣana-paṭiṭṭhitako'si dhīro.

very words by which the inscription refers to Ānanda-thera. As there is convincing proof that Buddhappiya lived in the twelfth century, the Ānanda-thera of the Polonnaruva inscription could very well have been his teacher.

In my edition of the inscription referred to above, I have given reasons for the identification of Tamba-raṭṭha mentioned therein with the country round Ligor (Nakhon Si Thammarat, the ancient Sri Dharmmarāja Nagara) in the Malay Peninsula. The authority of the Śailendra kings, one of whom built a *vihāra* at Negapatam in South India, extended to the Malaya Peninsula. If, therefore, the teacher of Buddhappiya had connections with Ligor, his position as the head of the *vihāra* established in South India by one of the Śailendra kings can be accounted for. It seems, therefore, that Buddhappiya became the head of the Cuḍāmaṇi-varma-*vihāra* in succession to his teacher, Ānanda, in whose foot-steps he also followed in his activities for the propagation of Buddhism in the Coja country.

From what we know of the Śailendra kings from their inscriptions, they seem to have been followers of the Mahāyāna form of Buddhism, but there is no evidence to show to what school of Buddhism the *vihāra* built at Negapatam by Māravijayattuṅga-varma originally belonged. From the foregoing, however, we find this *vihāra* under the control of Theravādins in the twelfth century. If the Śailendra kings who founded this *vihāra* were Mahāyanists, its passing over to the Theravādins is worthy of note.

The Theravāda seems to have been in the ascendant at Nakhon Si Thammarat (Śrī Dharmmarāja Nagara) in the thirteenth century. About the same time or somewhat earlier we find Theravāda supplanting the Mahāyāna in Siam and Cambodia. The passing of the *vihāra* at Negapatam to the control of the Theravādins who had intimate connections with Ceylon may also be taken as a part of this religious movement of which very few historical details are known to us at present.

The Tamil land and the Eastern Colonies

BY PROF. K. A. NILAKANTA SASTRI

Tamil influences on the early script, language, architecture and so on of the Malaya peninsula and archipelago have been traced by several scholars; but references to these lands in early Tamil literature are somehow not so frequent as one would expect. One decidedly early reference occurs in the *Paṭṭinappālai* where, among the imports into the city of Puhār or Kāveripattinam is included *Kālagattu ākkaṁ* i.e. produce from Kālagam, which has been interpreted to mean Kaḍāram, modern Kedah as Choedés demonstrated in his celebrated paper *La Royaume de Cérivijaya*¹. The equation of Kaḍāram with Kālagam is found in the geographical section of the *Divākaraṁ*, the earliest lexicon in the Tamil language now accessible to us. The *Paṭṭinappālai* is a poem of the time of Cōḷa Karikāla, and cannot be placed much later than the end of the second century A.D. or the beginning of the third.

It is the aim of this short note to invite attention to another of these all too rare early Tamil texts mentioning the eastern colonies and their trade connections with South India. It occurs in Canto XIV (ll. 106-10) of the *Śilappadikāram*, and reads :

ōṅgirim parappin
vaṅga-viṭṭattut-Toṇḍiyōr-iṭṭa
vagilun-dugilum-āvamum-vāsamun-
dogu-karuppūramuñ-jumanduḍan vanda
koṇḍaloḍu pugundu.

The literal meaning of these lines is as follows: 'Having entered together with the east wind that came laden with (the aroma) of aloe, silks, sandal, spices, and camphor put by the residents of Toṇḍi on board a fleet of tall roomy ships.' The place said to be entered is the city of Madura, an inland city; that is why the poet is careful to say that the person who entered the city did so with the eastern wind (*koṇḍal*); and the thought of the eastern wind calls up the image of an armada of merchantmen laden with the cargo of precious articles specified in lines 3 and 4 of the citation. It will be noticed that the articles are all of them special products of the eastern lands on which we have always depended for a supply of them, as the present war conditions have sharply reminded us.

There are two commentaries available on this text. The earlier commentary (anonymous) correctly interprets the text without introducing a single extraneous idea, and leaves it there; we may note, however, that the word *vāsam* (spices) is explained as comprising *takkōlam* (cubeb), *Jātikkāy* (nutmeg) and other substances. 'Takkōlam' would doubtless recall to the reader's mind the learned discussion of this word by Sylvain Lévi in his essay on *Ptolémée, Le Niddesa, et la Bṛhatkathā* in *Etudes Asiatiques*. The later annotator, Aḍiyārkkunallār who wrote sometime about the fourteenth century A.D. makes a greater display of the knowledge and beliefs of his time. The whole comment is too long for reproduction, and we shall notice only the points that concern our enquiry. He makes it clear that *Toṇḍi* was a town in the east—a natural inference from the mention of *Koṇḍāl* in the text, as *koṇḍāl* is a special name for the eastern wind. Then he says that the kings of *Toṇḍi* sent the articles mentioned as tribute to the ruler of Madura—an intrusive statement for which there is no warrant in the neutral words *Toṇḍiyor—ittā*, placed in ships by those of *Toṇḍi*—of the text of the poem. We should not hesitate to reject this suggestion of a political relation between the Pāṇḍyan kingdom and *Toṇḍi* of the East. The note on the list of articles is of great interest as bringing before us traces of a considerable technical lore of which the sources are unknown to us. Of *agil* (aloe wood), for instance, he mentions three varieties—*arumaṇavan*, *taḱḱoli*, *kiḍāraṇ*, obviously getting their names from *Rāmañña*, *Takkōla*, and *Kiḍāra* (*Kaḍāra*) very interesting from our point of view. Again, among the many varieties of *tugil* (silks) noticed is *Kālagam* i.e. produced in *Kālagam* or *Kaḍāram*. Among the varieties of *āram* (sandal) occurs *haricandana*, famous in early Javanese epigraphy as the material out of which images of *Agastya* were made at one time. Like his predecessor whom he closely follows generally, Aḍiyārkkunallār includes *taḱḱōlam* and *Jātikkāy*, cubeb and nutmeg, with many other substances like *lavaṅgam* under *vāsam*. Of camphor he seems to mention no fewer than fourteen kinds, *Cinaccūḍam*—China camphor—among them.

Finally, he crowns the whole by saying that '*Toṇḍiyor*' stands for '*śōlakulattor*' descendants of the *Coḷa* family. This comment has gone far to misguide modern students, and obscure the significance of the text for a long time. For the late Dr. Swaminatha Aiyer added a note to it saying that we may infer from this that there was a *Toṇḍi* on the east coast of South India which was different from the celebrated *Toṇḍi* of the *Ceras* on the west coast², and subject to the

² Tyndis of the *Periplus* and Ptolemy.

rule of the Coḷas. All these remarks have been reproduced in their entirety by Mr. V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar in his translation of the *Śilappadikāram*, and he goes one step further and identifies Toṇḍi of this text with the homonymous place on the coast of the Ramnad district; he recognises, however, that most of the articles mentioned came from the Archipelago islands in the east.³

The history of error is not without interest, and one is tempted to ask how did the learned Aḍiyārkkunallār come to gloss 'Toṇḍiyor' with 'śōlakūlattōr'? Was he thinking of the naval expeditions of the Coḷas against the empire of Śrīvijaya of which the memory might have been still alive in his time? If that was so, did the Coḷas leave behind a branch of the royal family to hold sway over their fresh conquests in these lands? But of all this we have little evidence from other sources. Or was the annotator only confusing 'Toṇḍiyor' with 'Toṇḍaiyar' and basing his gloss on the story in the *Maṇimekhalai* in which a Toṇḍaiyan is born out of the liaison between a Coḷa prince from Negapatam and a Nāga princess Pilivali by name? However that may be, he does not say anything on the location of Toṇḍi. It is placed on the east coast and more precisely identified with Toṇḍi on the Ramnad coast—a place which rose into some importance in the twelfth century A.D.—by the modern writers cited above. But then, how are we to explain the fleet of tall roomy ships on which these precious cargoes are placed by the people of Toṇḍi for their being carried off by the wind to the Madura coast?

It is clear the Toṇḍi must be some place in the lands colonised by the people of South India across the seas. We have a Tirunelveli in Jaffna, and a Madura island near Java, and other toponymous identities will easily occur to the student of the subject. At the moment I am unable to suggest any suitable identification, and it is my main object to place the facts as they appear to me before scholars who may not be readers of Tamil but whose co-operation would be of value in discovering this place.

I do not believe that the *Śilappadikāram* is an early work like the *Paṭṭinappalai*; in its present form it has too many words and features of grammar and prosody that point to a much later date. The reference in Kālidāsa's *Raghuvamśa* to winds from *dvīpāntara* (Malaya) laden with the fragrance of cloves is now well known;⁴ and I think that the present reference to Toṇḍi and its trade with the Madura coast is later than the text of Kālidāsa by about a century, if not more.

3 The *Śilappadikāram* or the *Lay of the Anklet* (1939), p. 204 n. 1.

4 *JGIS.*, Vol. 1X, *Dvīpāntara*.

Geographical Notes on the Kurram Valley

By DR. V. S. AGRAWALA

Kurram Valley derives its name from the river Kurram which flows through it. Fortunately this river finds mention in the *R̥gveda* under the name of Krumu (कुरु) in the following two verses :—

So let not Rasa, Krumu or Anitabhā, Kubhā or Sindhu hold you back.

Let not the watery Sarayū obstruct your ways. With us be all the bliss Ye give (*R̥gveda*, V. 53. 9).

First with Tṛṣṭāmā thou art eager to flow forth with Rasā, and Susartu, and with Śvetyā here.

With Kubhā; and with these Sindhu! and Mehatnu, thou seekest in thy course Krumu and Gomatī. (*R̥gveda*, X. 75. 6).

From the above it appears that these rivers, viz. Tṛṣṭāmā, Rasa, Anitabhā, Susartu, Śvetyā, Kubhā, Mehatnu, Krumu and Gomatī were the affluents of the great river Sindhu or Indus meeting it on its right bank. The tributaries of the Indus on its left bank are mentioned in a different verse in which the river Sohan flowing through the Rawalpindi district is called Sushomā. The Swat river is the same as the Suvāstu of the *Mahābhārata* and the Purāṇas, but in the *R̥gveda* its form seems to be Śvetyā. Kubhā is the same as the Kabul, whereas Krumu is Kurram and Gomatī is Gomal.

The Safed-Koh range on the Indo-Afghan border seems to be the same as the ancient Śvetapatha. In the inscriptions found in the Sānchi Stūpas we have reference to a Greek of Śvetapatha making some donations as follows :—

'Setapathiyasa yonasa dānam, i. e., the gift of a Yona (Greek) resident of Setapatha (Safed-Koh)' (*Monuments of Sanchi* by Sir John Marshall, Vol. I, Inscriptions No. 89 and 475; 308 and 348).

Northern Waziristan through which flows the river Tochi was visited by the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsang and is referred to by him under the name Ki-Kiang-na (Watters, *Hiuen Tsang's Travels*, II. 62). It is the same as Qiqin of early Arab history and it was known in the *Mahābhārata* as the Kokanada region. The Kokanadas were a people in the north-west, vanquished by Arjuna in the course of his conquest (*Mbh.* Sabhāparavan. ch. XXVII, verse 18), Southern Waziristan enclosing the Wana valley with its capital at Wana is ancient Vanāyu

famous all along in Sanskrit literature for its breed of fine horses. Bannu east of Waziristan is referred to in Pāṇini's *Āṣṭādhyāyī* (circa fifth century B. C.) under the name of Varṇu. Hiuen Tsang refers to Bannu as *Phalana* and says that the country to the west of *Phalana* was *Ki-Kiang-na*.

In and beyond the northern portion of the N. W. F. Province some further identifications of names may be suggested e.g. Hindukusa was known to the ancient Iranians as Upariśyena, i. e. a hill so high as to the beyond the flight of the eagle. Chitral is ancient Chitraka, also called Kāraṣakara. The Panjkora is ancient Gaurī, referred to by the Greek writers as the Gouraios. Between the Panjkora and the Indus flows the river Swat which was the ancient Suvāstu. The Swat valley was known as the Uḍḍiyāna country in Buddhist geography. It is referred to as Urdi (derivative Aurdāyani) in the *Mahābhāṣya* of Patañjali (second century B. C.). A trace of this is found in modern Udegaon. South of Swat is Malakand whose ancient name was Mālāvat. In the same region is Dargai with its ancient name Dārgalas. The great tribe of the Mohmands living to the north of the Kabul river are mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* and in Pāṇini's *Āṣṭādhyāyī* as *Madhumanta* (Pāṇini, IV. 3. 93). The ancient name of the well-known Afridis is *Apritāh*, known from the same source (Pāṇini, Rājanyādi Group, IV. 2. 53). Charsadda above the junction of the Panjkora with the Kabul is the region of ancient Puṣkalāvati occupied by the people called *Puṣkalāh*. Geographically the region of Peshawar was known as the Gandhāra country with its eastern extension upto Shahdheri. The western capital of Gandhāra was at Puṣkalāvati near Charsadda and the eastern capital at Takṣaśilā. The river Bara which flows past Peshawar and joins the Kabul was known in older days as the Varā (*Mbh.* Bhīṣmaparvan, Ch. IX). In a way the history of the Kurram region partakes of the general history of the whole Gandhāra region for which there is enough material from the Vedic times to the historic periods.

Background of Sufism in Indian Environment

BY MR. M. L. ROY CHOWDHURY

Once in a trance Muḥammad is said to have asked his wife Ayesha, states the author of *Kunṣul Asar il Qidam*, "Man Anti"—who art thou? Ayesha replied, "Ana Ayesha"—I am Ayesha. Muḥammad said, "Man Ayesha"—who is Ayesha? Ayesha answered, "Ibnatus Siddiq"—daughter of Siddiq, Prophet's father-in-law, Muḥammad again asked,—"Who is Siddiq?" Ayesha was now astonished and replied, "the father-in-Law of Muḥammad." Muḥammad repeated, "Who is Muhammad?"

Now Ayesha remained silent, for she understood that the Prophet was in another state of existence where the index of life had become "All is he—Hama Oust" सांझ ।

And thus Muhammad was the first Sufi of Islam and his stage of experiences is called the ecstasy—"Hal" or (समाधि)

Ibrahim Bin Adam belonged to the royal family of Balkh. "Forty scimitars of gold and forty maces of gold were borne in front of him and behind." Once on a hunting, he heard a voice, "Awake Ibrahim, wert thou made for this?" He left his royal robes and exchanged them for woollen coats of a shepherd, bade farewell to his kingdom and lived in a cave near Naysabi for long nine years. He cried out in agony of his soul, "Oh God, from shame of disobedience to the glory of submission unto thee." And Ibrahim was a Sufi, his stage is called Renunciation—(वैराग्य)

Shaqiq of Balkh resigned himself entirely to the hands of God and made no effort even to maintain his living, for he must not ask anything; nor engage in a trade, his business was God alone. "Nineteenths of devotion consists in flight from mankind," said the Shaqiq, and "the remaining tenth is in a silence." And Shaqiq was a Sufi; his stage is silence (नीरवता)

Rabia, that mystic Rabia was once asked, "do you love God"?

"Yes"—was her reply.

"Do you hate the Devil?"—was the next query—

She replied, "My love of God leaves me no leisure to hate Devil."

On another occasion the Prophet appeared before Rabia in a dream and asked, "Rabia—do you love me?" Rabia answered, "Oh apostle of God, who does not love thee? But love of God hath so absorbed me that neither love nor hatred of anything remains in my heart."

And Rabia was a Sufi and her stage was love. (प्रेम)

Yet these mystics were not called Sufis when they lived on the surface of the earth, or the term Sufi did not come into existence till two hundred years after the Prophet's death. The word "*Tasawwuf*" was not mentioned either in "*Sittiah*" compiled in 392 A.H. or even in the "*Qamus*" the standard Arabic Dictionary compiled in 817 A.H. the pious men at the time of the Quran were known as "*Muqurrabin*" (neighbours of God), "*Abrar*" (virtuous men) "*Zuhhad*" (pious men); but there were no "*Sufis*" as such, though the root from which the word has been derived existed in the vocabulary¹

The two hundred years following the death of Muhammad were characterised by devastating civil wars, relentless military despotism and hard mechanical piety of the orthodox creed which led to a revolt towards asceticism and quietism amongst hundreds of followers of the Faith. Wearied and disgusted with the political strifes and insecurity of individual safety, they retired from the things of the world and devoted themselves to things of God. The terror of hell so exhaustively and graphically described in the Quran roused in them an intense consciousness of sin which drove them to seek salvation in ascetic practices and in being sinless. With the quietism was rather a religion and not a speculative system; and they styled themselves Muslims. To them recitation of the Divine names (*Zikr*) was superior to five canonical prayers; and trust in God (*Tawakkul*) meant renunciation of personal initiative and volition resigning oneself in

1 The word Sufi is supposed to have been derived from:—

(a) '*Saf*'—meaning woolen, for the learned men wore woolen garments and lived in caves and monasteries.

(b) '*Soaaf*' meaning "in the direction"—to turn the face to one direction and Sufis are those who turn their faces to the direction of God

(c) "*Suffa*"—there was a sect whose members were celibates; they served Kaba and worshipped God. The Sufi came from the old "*sufa*" for they were sincere. "*Sufa*" means sincerity.

(d) "*Suff*" ich means "a line—those who form the "first line" of lovers of God and their work is called "*Tasawwuf*."

(e) "*Saf*" meaning a coach; during the time of Muhammad one group of people came from outside to learn Islam. They were given seats on a "*Sofa*" (raised platform) from where they learnt everything. Sufi refers these men. Their "sincere" is called "*Tasawwuf*."

(f) "*Safu*" meaning purity" according to Arabic Grammar Rumi and Hafiz, supported this derivation.

(g) "*Sophia*"—some claim its Greek origin—"Sophia"—wisdom.

God's hands i.e., in short, with them trust in God meant absence of activity to the extent of not seeking means of livelihood or even not taking medicine when ill. This attitude of life meaning the withdrawal of self has been described as quietism of Islam which soon passed into mysticism meaning concentration "in the inward life of dying to self and living in God."** Along with the growth of mysticism, germs of which had already existed in Islam and in the Prophet's life, new methods of expression of the mystic became increasingly frequent through symbolism of Love and Wine side by side. With this quietistic and devotional growth sprang up a speculative and pantheistic movement which was more un-Islamic than Islamic, inviting sharp comments and fierce opposition of the orthodox.²

The evolution of Sufism up to this point, I mean until the middle of the 3rd century Hijra, may be called inherently Islamic.

So long there was no fixed process of these quietists, and devotionalists developed on the lines of Islamic canons and according to the mystic Khwaja Khan, the doctrine of *Tasawwuf* were taught by songs. Zonmon Al Misri (860 A.D.) was the first to put their doctrines in form; Juniyad of Bagdad (910 A.D.) to systematise the same and Abu Bakr Shibli to preach them officially.

Thus far I have developed my subject in such a way as to give my readers a definite idea that Sufism was a purely Islamic growth. Nicholson in his famous "*History of Arabic Literature*" traced the growth of Sufism to the influence of Christianity, Neo-Platonism, Gnosticism, and Buddhism. E. G. Browne in his still more famous "*Literary History of Persia*" tells us that Sufism grew out of congenial soil in the mystic environments of Persia. The theosophical publications from Adyar on the subject of Sufism in Sindh postulated that the Hindu Vedanta was the "via Illuminativa of Sufism and the "broken lights" that fell on their paths in India diverted them to newer paths.

Nicholson says that the early quietists of Islam were influenced by the Euchite Christians of Syria "who magnified the beauty of constant prayers, abandoned their all and travelled as poor brethren." Biographies of Sufi Saints abound in graphic conversations between Muslim devotees and Christian ascetics which bear traces of Christian influence on their life. Nicholson says that the monastic life

² Abu Bakr Shibli defined Sufism as—As Sufi la Yara Fid darain ma Allah Ghyar Ullah Sufi does not recognise any one except Allah in both the worlds.

Abdul Hasan Nuri says—At Tasawwuf Yataraku Kulli hazzin nafsi Sufism is renunciation of all pleasures of the body.

which ~~has~~ been rigorously prohibited by the Prophet had come into the Sufi ordination possibly from the proximity of, if not, association with the Christian monastic orders which the latter took from the Buddhists. Buddhism flourished in Balkh, Transoxiana, Turkestan long before their incorporation by Islam. It is a fact that the Buddhists had carried their teachings amongst the Muslims who now came in touch with them. The legend of Ibrahim which has been quoted above—a prince of Balkh who one day suddenly cast off his royal robes and became wandering Sufi, was nothing but a replica of Gautama's renunciation of his kingdom. Goldziher in his famous treatise on "*The Influence of Buddhism upon Islam*" writes that the doctrine of "fana" (annihilation) is nothing but Buddhist '*nirvāṇa*' and the system of "stations" on the road thereto bears a close resemblance to Buddhism. By that time i.e., between 800 A.D. and 860 A.D. the Greek theosophy flowed into Islam through the Catholicity of the Abassid Khalifas from the Christian monasteries of Syria, from the Persian Academy at Jundeshpur in Khurdisthan and from the Sabians of Haran in Mesopotamia. It is really significant that Zun nun of Egypt who first worked up the floating theosophy of Sufism into a system was by birth a Christian, by race a Coptic or Nubian and by adoption a Muslim. It is equally significant that the Muta'zzalite rationalism filtered into Islam after it had come in touch with the Hellenistic ideas through its association with Alexandrian speculation.

However plausible and learned may be the arguments of those eminent scholars, I do hold that one need not seek for the origin of Sufism anywhere beyond Islam. Islam with its stern rigidity, clear commands, emphatic no-s was very congenial to the growth of Sufism. From the earliest days of Islam we note an attempt by the Muslim sages to go beyond the path of every day Islam without completely breaking away from it; thus psychologically interpreted, the attitude of the seers of Islam was to find out some sort of sanction from the Quran, so that they might follow their religious convictions without much torment of conscience—for Islam would not suffer any departure—not even by a dot from the orthodox interpretations of the recognised Divines.

Theirs was the attempt to live within Islam, but to think beyond Islam and act beyond its ritualist code. In short, they continued to offer lip-service to the established religion while as they progressed, they modified and softened the dogmas in such a way as to suit their own spiritual needs. Interpretation of some of the verses of Quranic revelations were carried to such an extent that "*Allah*" the god of

warth and mercy was depersonalised and worshipped as an abstract idea under the title of "*Al-Haq*"—the Truth. That this interpretation did not find favour with the orthodox *Ulama* is proved by the way in which they sought to repress the Sufis and rationalists when they tried to express their attitude of mind in terms of action.

From quietism to mysticism it is not a long run, and from mysticism to pantheism it is still a nearer approach. Islam with its absence of a metaphysical background was a fruitful soil for the growth of pantheism. And when Semitic Islam conquered Aryan Persia, we find that the Aryan Monism of Persia in which "God ceases to be a Being external to the individual and Law is no longer a command imposed from without" offered her an excellent stage of development. Had not Islam come in contact with Aryan metaphysics or Greek intellectual abstractions, we cannot hazard what would have been the course of Islam inspite of the attempts of early ascetics or mystics to give it a safety-valve compensating her bankruptcy in metaphysics.³

In Arabia there might have been another prophet to soften her unquestioned faith in metaphysics or there might have been a religious war as in Europe in the 16th and 17th centuries. Ethics of Semitic Islam mixed up with Aryan metaphysics of Persia blossomed forth into the beautiful Pantheism which is known by the general name of Iranian Sufism.

The first step from theosophy to Pantheism was taken by a Persian, the celebrated Bayazid (875 A.D.)—son of Zoroastrian tutored by a Kurd. He introduced openly the doctrine of "*Fana*"—self-annihilation and in a charmed moment he exclaimed, "I went from God to God while they cried from me in me, O thou I."

In his Pantheistic vein he felt, "Verily I am God there is no God except me; so worship me." When he conceived the unity of worlds by his side, he cheered himself; "I came forth from Bayazid-ness, as a snake from its skin. Then I looked, I saw that the lover, beloved, and love are one, for in the world, by unification all can be one." Or in other words, "I am the wine-drinker, I am the wine and I am the cup-bearer."

In course of a century after the great Bayazid had passed away, Sufism which in Arabia was simple quietism and asceticism passed

³ Shaikh Abu Said Abul Khair (1040 A.D.) went to the length of believing in the doctrine of Tanasukh (Transmigration), Naksh (re-incarnation) into the body of animals (Maskh), Vegetables, (Faskh) or minerals (Raskh). Abu Muslim of Khurasan actually based his arguments on *Suratul Bagara* on the doctrine of re-incarnation. This is certainly an instance of the influence of the Aryan doctrine of transmigration of the Soul.

through natural stages of mysticism and theosophy only to become pantheism and monism through its contact with the Persian Aryanism. On the other hand what was at the outset only a form of life adopted by the individuals whose spiritual needs communicated to a small group of friends, could not be satisfied within the ethical limits of Islam, in course of time became a monistic system—a school for saints organised between *Pir* and *Murid*—master and disciple.

The doctrines of these saints soon began to be collected and systematised in treatises such as the *Qutul Qulub* by Abu Talib Makki (996 A.D.), *Kitab-ul-Lumma* by Abu Nasar-al-Sarraj, *Risala* by Qashay-riyya etc. The moment the doctrines began to be collected, there arose sects amongst the Sufis and in a short time we find the Darweshis, Adawiyyas (1163 A.D.), Qadiris (1166 A.D.) and Rafias. The Mevlevis were a Sufi order formed by the great Persian mystic Jala-luddin Rumi with whom pantheism remained a living faith tinged with his characteristic melancholy tone (1273 A.D.). He desired in his pantheistic mood to go back to God from whom he emanated under the allegory of a flute crying to go back to the bamboo stock from which it was separated.

“Oh hear the flute’s sad tale again
Of separation I complain
Ever since it was my fate to be
Thus cut off from my parent tree,
Sweet moan I live made in the pensive sigh
While men and women join my cry.
Man’s life is like this hollow rod;
One end is in the lips of God
And from the other sweet notes fall,
That to the mind and spirit call,
And join us in the All in All.”

The Sufis by that time became targets of attacks of the orthodox order owing to their free thinking and pantheistic ideas. Thanks to the efforts of great Ghazzali, the Sufis could win a secure position in the Islamic world; Ghazzali interpreted the Islamic theology from a mystical standpoint and he reconciled it with the sayings of the Sufis by giving it a metaphysical background. It was he who gave the “relations” (Kasuf) of the mystics a place by the side of the “traditions” (Taqid) and “Reason” (Aql) as a fundamental principle of the faith. Thus the orthodox was constrained to tolerate the worship of saints, miracles of the “Awliya” and veneration of tombs of holy men, through the strict interpretations of Shariat could never permit the same.

In Persia the Sufis found a very convenient soil, and the phenomenal progress it made could be read in the contemporary poetry of Iran. Imagery, allegory and fantasy which are distinguishing characteristics of Persian poetry received forceful treatment in the transcendental out-pourings of the Sufi writers of the period. Of them Abu Said Bin Abul Khair of Khurasan expressed the relations between man and God and that between beauty and intoxication in most enchanting terms. "The real basis of their poetry," says Von Kramer, "is a lofty ethical system which recognised in the purity of heart, charity, self-renunciation and bridling of passions, the necessary conditions of eternal happiness." Attached to this we find a pantheistic theory of the emanation of all things from God and their ultimate reunion with Him. In his famous *Masnavi* Jalaluddin Rumi wrote :—

"God is the sole reality (Al-Haq) and is above all names and definitions. He is not only the absolute Being but also absolute Beauty. It is the nature of Beauty to desire manifestation, the phenomenal universe is the result of this desire in which God says, 'I was a hidden treasure and I desire to be known, so I created creatures in order that I might be known.' Human soul belongs to the spiritual world and is ever seeking to be reunited to its source. Such union is hindered by the bodily sense, but it can be enjoyed at times before death by a stage called 'Hal', ecstasy, where the veil of sensual perception is rent asunder and the Soul is merged in God."

There is yet another direction in which Persian Aryanism influenced the Semitic Islam, I mean in the direction of the doctrine of salvation through the preceptor. It is well-known that to an Aryan, the relation between the sensible and the real world has been brought by a series of incarnations in which the Creator himself comes to teach the Law to the Created. But according to the Semitic conception it is an Angel, generally Gabriel, that brings the message of the other world into this. The Aryan doctrine of incarnation and personal relationship between the visible and invisible through the agency of a visible medium, was very favourable to the growth of the idea of "*Murshid*" and "*Murid*" (Master and disciple) in Persia. In fact this doctrine carried to its extreme length has supplied to the philosophic background of the development of Shi'ism in which Ali and the Imams are more or less the anointed interpreters of the messages of God. They hold that the secrets of the messages of God and Islam lie not in the lines of the Quran, but between the lines, and more often beyond them. The Prophet initiated only his immediate disciples into these secrets. Thus Ali was the first to whom Muhammad confided the secret of inner Islam, and from Ali it was transmitted to the twelve

Imams. The Imam divulged these secrets of spiritual effulgence to those only whom he considered fit to hold this message and this process was handed down from generation to generation round which grew the doctrine of "Murshid" and "Murid" in Islam in a wider form under the caption of *Pir Muridi*.

In short Shi'ism thus interpreted, as Mukhtar holds, is nothing but a highly Aryanised interpretation of Islam where the Prophet and Imams are more or less divine incarnations.

The pantheistic doctrine of Iran in which every thing is a manifestation of God and there is nothing apart from Him was very favourable to the growth of the conception that the highest bliss lies in the ultimate union with that Impersonal Being from which the Creation has emanated. The secret of this process through which this union can be attained is known, as the Aryan thinks, only to the souls that have been *illuminated*. Thus to an Iranian, the idea of association with a Being more developed and more illuminated approaching the highest impersonal Being, was but a logical process of the Aryan theory of incarnation. Carried further, this process conceived that the illuminated Soul of the teacher acts as an intermediary between the Creator and the created. The Aryan believes that the miraculous powers of the Illuminated Soul of the *Pir* (Guru) may be brought to the use and advantage of the disciple. This belief in *Guru* (*Pir*) has been carried to an extreme length when Hafiz propounded.

"Drown your carpet into wine, if your *Pir* says so;

For your guide knows the way and 'its destination."

The most hateful thing of Islam, I mean wine, even may be indulged in, if *Pir* so desires; *Guru* was thus given a place far above the covenanted message. The curtain that lies between God and man may be lifted only by the *Pir*, and in Persia in one form Sufism ultimately resolved itself more or less almost into a worship by the *Pirs*.

By the 13th century when Islam came in direct touch with Indo-Aryan mind in India we find the fullest development of Sufism in this direction.

Islam had already come in touch with India through her conquest of Sind, that mystic Sind which was the meeting ground of so many cultures and civilisations from the very ancient times. Sind was pulsating with new thoughts of *Advaita* philosophy of *Śaṅkarāchārya* when Muhammad bin Qasim conquered the land. Forty years of Arab rule historically is nothing but a romantic episode in Indian annals, but from the standpoint of culture it saw the acclimatisation of Islam on Indian soil. Soon the conquering hordes melted away and dissolved into Indian soil which from the standpoint of culture became

the foundation of a movement, the exponents being Lal Shah, Firuz, Baholul and others. A transcendental Vedantic tone pervades the out-pourings of these Muslim saints, from which have been quoted quatrains of following centuries including those of the famous Shamsuddin Tabrez.

For two hundred and forty years after Muhammad bin Qasim, there was practically no physical movement of Islam towards India, when India was rather making a silent headway into Islam through the translation of her philosophy during the Abbasid period. Beginning from Mansur, Indian philosophy filtered through the Sanskrit schools that were established in Baghdad by the converted Barmaki family, especially by Barmaki Yahayah, Khalid, and Jafar; innumerable references to Sanskrit works have been found in the contemporary Muslim literatures both of Arabia and Persia. By the time Ghazni conquered Hindustan, Indian philosophies specially Yogaśāstra, Logic, Astronomy, and medicine had become great favourites with the illuminati of the Islamic world. Al Beruni may be regarded as a great transmitter of Indian ideas into Islam. The four centuries that followed Al Biruni, was the period when Persia was synthesising Islam in the east, while Turks were vulgarising Islam in the north East. It is significant that Islam was spread in India through these Turko-Afghans who had no great cultural heritage to boast of and themselves were but half-Muslim in the strict sense of the term. If Islam was making her physical conquest of Hindustan through these Turko-Afghans, India was Hinduising Islam through the elastic and absorbing tendencies inherent in her culture. Contemporary writings of Amir Khusrau, Malik Muhammad Jaisi, Kabir, Kamal bear innumerable traces of Hindu influences on the Muslim thoughts of the Turko-Afghan period of Indian history. As the movement towards domicilisation of Islam continued further, we find the importation of purely Hindu ideas into the citadel of Islam through the incompletely converted Hindus. The advent of Darweshes, Awliyas and saints like Mainuddin Chisti, Ruknuddin, Nizamuddin Awliya and others, had a peculiar significance in Indian cultural history.

The Eastern mind is generally a worshipper of personalities more than of principles. The existence of these saints naturally attracted the local population through their piety, sympathy and spiritual effulgence. Towards the latter parts of the Turko-Afghan period, the Hindus were gradually softening their exclusiveness and approaching their Muslim brethren who had by then become permanent factors in their society. This process of fusion found a partial consummation in the rise of saints like Rāmānanda, Chaitanya, Kabir, Nānak, and

others, to name a few only. These Hindu and Muslim saints found ready response amongst the followers of both the communities. The "Dargas" (Resorts) of Muslim "Pirs" as well as the "Akhras" of Hindu "Sants" became the common resort of the followers of both the faiths by the 15th century. The Mahdi movement which prophesied the appearance of a Regenerator of Islam under the title of *Al-Mahdi* after 1000 years of Muhammad gave a new pulsation inside Islam. A number of celebrities claimed the dignity of *Al-Mahdi* both in India and in the north-west. Thus from the middle of the 10th century Hijra in India there were three liberal movements of Islam working systematically, one to the north working from the south through Sufis like Lal Sah and Firuz, the second through Mahdists like Bayazid, Islam Shah and Shaikh Mubarak, and the third working through Kabir, Jaisi, Kamal, and others; while a Hindu movement was traversing the whole of Hindustan working through saints like Chaitanya, Nānak and others. The great eclectic system called the *Din-i-Ilahi* was nothing but a wave of this thought-process working through the great Imperial theosophist, Akbar. This eclectic process continued till the middle of the 17th century when it collapsed with the death of *Dara Shuko*. This was the most fruitful period of the growth of Sufism in Indian history gathering around the personalities of the saints and master-minds of Islam in India, and no history of Sufism can be written without a thorough study of the life and time of *Dara Shuko*.⁴

I have already pointed out that ex-Arabian Islam had by that time been steadily developing the idea of worship of *Gurus* through the personalities of illumined souls and that it had been more or less reconciled with orthodox sects outside Arabia through the efforts of Imam Ghazzali. Once on Indian soil, this idea of worship round the personality of a higher being ultimately dwindled into the worship of that personality—a process which was also not unknown in Persia. From his childhood an Indian is impregnated with the idea that—"God wants a union with Him that wants Him. Every heart is an abode of God. But he has eyes yet he sees Him not; he has legs yet he approaches Him not. He has capacities yet they are latent." An Indian is always told that these latent capacities can be developed so that he might see, feel, and approach Him; but it must be through a medium. Therefore he must associate himself with a soul that is already illumined. Thus both the Hindus and Muslims approached the

4 In *Sirr-i-Akbar*, *Dara Shuko* used many of the Indian terms to represent the Sufi ideas and *vice versa* which clearly show the influence of Hindu ideas that penetrated into Islam.

illuminated souls of saints to show them the way to God and draw them to a plane of higher existence.

As no two men are similar to each other in all respects, so no two souls are similar in their spiritual experiences. Each of these illuminated souls spread his illumination to his immediate circle in his own way and thus round about each saint grew up a special organisation or religious order infused with the spirit and form of the personality who occupied the centre. In no time in India there grew up different orders and organisations round the personality of different saints the most important of them being:—

Chistia, Shattari, Qadiria, Naqas Bandia, Surhawardia and Be-Shara

There are again orders within orders and sub-orders, too, according to the experiences of Pirs and disciples.

The Indian Sufi Orders rest entirely on the *Pir* or *Guru*. It is expected that every *Pir* shall win for his disciple the Divine favours through his advanced powers. There is the system of initiation to give the first ordination amongst the Indian Sufis in imitation of Indian initiation (मन्त्रदान). But the Sufi ceremony is much simpler—the disciple is to place his hand on that of his master and swear allegiance to him. After initiation the Sufi is supposed to be a traveller (*Salik*) in the path (*Tariqat*), and he is to plod on and to observe the rules of the order including ritualistic observances such as Zkr, Remembrance (ध्यान).

He has then to pass through several stages of spiritual existence before he reaches his destination and they are *Nasut*, *Malaḥut*, *Jabrut*, and *Lahut* almost similar to the Indian *Annamaya Koṣa*, *Prāṇamaya Koṣa*, *Jñānamaya Koṣa* and *Hiraṇmayā Koṣa*. Different names have been given to these stations by different Pirs such as *Shariat*, *Tariqat*, *Maarfat* and *Haqiqat*—these too have Indian synonyms for them such as *Karmakāṇḍa*, *Upāsanākāṇḍa*, *Jñānakāṇḍa* and *Samādhi*.

In the stage of *Shariat* the disciple moves in the circle of rules of conduct as laid down by the Law of Religion; in the second stage of *Tariqat* he enters into the spirit of Laws; in the stage of *Maarfat* he understands the relation between God and his creations. In the final stage of *Haqiqat* he completely dissolves into God. In this ecstasy he cries out as did the great Sufi—

“I am God, I am God, I am God.”

Editorial Notes

On the 16th June 1944 Sir P. C. Ray, the esteemed President of the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society, breathed his last at his residence in the University College of Science, Calcutta. The following resolution was passed by the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society at its meeting held immediately thereafter:—

“Resolved that the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society records its profound sense of grief at the lamented death of Sir P. C. Ray, Kt., D.Sc., Ph.D., its much respected President for the last ten years. His was a dedicated life—dedicated to all noble causes tending to benefit his countrymen and relieve suffering humanity. His numerous and magnificent contributions to the advancement of his countrymen in widely different fields will be gratefully remembered by them and will be an endless source of inspiration to them in future times. The Greater India Society has been benefitted along with numerous other institutions by his sage guidance and his generous patronage.”

An obituary notice of the late lamented scientist, patriot and humanitarian will be published in the next number of this Journal.

* * * * *

On the occasion of the first visit of Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, the new Director-General of Archaeology in India, to Calcutta, the members of the Greater India Society met him in the rooms of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal on the 14th June 1944 at 4.45 p.m. At the meeting Dr. Wheeler, in response to the request of the Hony. Secretary, accepted the office of Vice-President of the Managing Committee of the Society and he further agreed to give a general permission to the officers of his Department to contribute papers to the Society's Journal, subject only to the normal rule of his preliminary inspection before publication. To indicate its high appreciation of the wholehearted support accorded to the Society by Dr. Wheeler, the Managing Committee authorised the Hony. Secretary to present him with a select list of the Society's publications including a complete set of its Journal up-to-date. These were presented through the intermediary of Mr. T. N. Ramachandran, the then Curator of the

Archaeological Section of the Indian Museum, Calcutta and member of the Managing Committee of the Society.

* * * * *

The Managing Committee of the Greater India Society gratefully acknowledges the receipt of the following donations since the beginning of the current year :—

Dr. Narendra Nath Law	Rs. 100/-
Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt	Rs. 50/-
Dr. U. N. Ghoshal	Rs. 50/-

* * * * *

In sending out the present Stein Memorial Number of the Journal of the Greater India Society, the editor expresses his grateful thanks to the scholars from and outside India who have contributed articles inspite of the difficult conditions prevailing at present. Some of the articles which were received too late are reserved for publication in the next number of this Journal which will also be issued in honour of the late great explorer and Orientalist.

Sir Marc Aurel Stein Memorial Number—Part II

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XI

JULY, 1944

No. 2

EDITED BY

U. N. GHOSHAL

Articles :

The Early Population of Lou-lan-Shan-shan (Dr. F. W. Thomas)	...	45
Warucān=Śāh (Dr. W. B. Henning)	...	85
Viranipatnam (R. E. M. Wheeler)	...	91
Some References to Kaṭāha Dvīpa in Ancient Indian Literature (Dr. V. S. Agrawala)	...	96
Editorial Notes :	...	98
Obituary Notice :	...	99

Published by—

THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY, CALCUTTA

Agents outside India—

Messrs. LUZAC & CO., 46, Great Russell Street, London, W. C. 1.

Annual Subscription— Rs. 4-8 or 8s. 6d., including postage

Greater India Society (Established 1927)

Aims and Objects

1. To organise the study of Indian Culture in Greater India (*i.e.* Serindia, India Minor, Indo-China and Insulindia) as well as in China, Korea, Japan and other countries of Asia.
2. To arrange for publication of the results of researches into the history of India's spiritual and cultural relations with the outside world.
3. To create an interest in the history of Greater India and connected problems among the students in the schools, colleges, and Universities of India by instituting a systematic study of those subjects and to take proper steps to stimulate the same.
4. To popularise the knowledge of Greater India by organising meetings, lantern lectures, exhibitions and conferences.

Membership Rules

1. The annual subscription payable by members is Rs. 12/- only. Members are entitled to receive the publications of the Society at concession rates and copies of the Journal of the Society free of cost.
2. Resident members may have access to the Society's collection of books, pamphlets and periodicals etc. on application either to the Honorary Secretary of the Society or the Librarian. Calcutta University. The Society's collection is housed, by arrangement with the Calcutta University authorities, in the University Library.

Officers and Members of the Managing Committee, Greater India Society, 1944

President—Dr. Shyamaprasad Mookerjee, M.A., D.Litt. Bar-at-Law.

Vice-Presidents—Rao Bahadur K.N. Dikshit, M.A., O.C. Gangoly, Esq.,
Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, D.Litt.

Hony. Secretary—Dr. U. N. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D.

Hony. Jt. Secretary—Dr. Kalidas Nag, M.A.; D.Litt. (Paris.)

Other Members of the Committee—Dr. Narendra Nath Law, M.A., Ph.D., Prof. Suniti Kumar Chatterjee, M.A., D.Litt. (Lond.); Dr. Prabodh Chandra Bagchi, M.A., D.Litt. (Paris); Dr. Nalinaksha Dutt, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (London.); Mm. Vidhusekhara Bhattacharyya; Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, M.A., Ph.D., D.Litt. (Leiden); Dr. Jitendranath Banerjea, M.A., Ph.D.; T.N. Ramachandran, Esq., M.A.

JOURNAL OF THE GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

Published twice a year, in January and July. Annual Subscription—Rs. 4-8 or 8s.-6d.—inclusive of postage. Volumes I-X already published.

NOTICE

The *Journal of the Greater India Society* closes its 11th year with the publication of this issue. Subscribers desiring to continue their patronage to the *Journal* are earnestly requested to remit their annual subscription for the 12th year as early as possible.

35, Badurbagan Row, }
Calcutta. }

Manager.



Sir Marc Aurel Stein
(1862-1943)

THE
JOURNAL
OF THE
GREATER INDIA SOCIETY

VOL. XI

JULY, 1944

No. 2

The Early Population of Lou-lan-Shan-shan

BY DR. F. W. THOMAS

Concerning the small state of Lou-lan or Shan-shan, situated to the south and south-west of Lop-nor, i.e. the Lop lake and salt-encrusted morass in Chinese Turkestan, a certain amount of information was made accessible in 1756 by the publication of Deguignes' *Historie générale des Huns*; see Vol. I, Part II, pp. 11-2. The particulars adduced were mainly, as in the case of the other states, those recorded in the *Former Han Annals* of the Chinese; but Marco Polo's account of the 'town of Lop' was also brought in. Thus the geographical situation of the state, as lying mostly south of the terminal course of the joined Tarim and Cer-cen rivers where they approach Lop-nor and as having on the 'south-east' the mountains and peoples of 'Tibet,' was adequately defined, and the mainly desert character of the land was described. In the text (chapter no. 96) of the *Annals*, translated by A. Wylie in 1881-2,¹ the gazetteer-like entries are accompanied by a historical relation wanting in the case of most of the other states. This was due to the initial importance of Lou-lan, as immediately adjoining the new Chinese north-western frontier resulting from the expulsion, c. 121 B.C., of the Hsiung-nu domination from what is now Kan-su. After the first relations, soon established, with China the state had to trim its policy in the face of the Hsiung-nu power, still able to threaten through the Chü-shih territory

1. *Journal of the R. Anthropological Institute*, X, pp. 20-73, XI, pp. 83-115; also (1926) De Groot, *Die Westlande Chinas in der vorchristlichen Zeit*, pp. 46-182.

on the north, and the fluctuations of Chinese control over Turkestan and Pamir kingdoms. In 77 B.C. it had to admit a Chinese military colony under a Commandant-general, and, with its name changed to *Shan-shan*, it remained for the most part subservient to China. For the period 25-239 A.D. the *Later Han Annals* and the *Wei-lüo*,² both translated by Chavannes, afford some further information. During the period c. 25-73 A.D., when Chinese influence was in abeyance, there were in Turkestan, besides Hsiung-nu interpositions, also interstate struggles, in the course of which, after c. 60 A.D.,³ two states became predominant in the regions south of the desert, namely *Shan-shan*, which extended as far west as the Niya river, absorbing the former small kingdoms of Calmadana (Cer-cen), Hsiao-wan in the southern mountains, Caq'ota (Ching-chüeh) on the river, and Parvata (Jung-lu, Pe-pin) on the upper reaches of that river, and on the other hand, Khotan, which became its neighbour. From c. 73 A.D. *Shan-shan* was again dominated by China; and some few years after 119 A.D. a new military colony was established at a junction of routes in the desert region north of the Tarim river, receiving the name *Lou-lan* in memory of the ancient designation of the state.⁴ As long as that colony existed, i.e. at least until the first half of the IVth century A.D.,⁵ *Shan-shan* must have been under the control of some Chinese power; and even later it was subject to interferences and invasions from that side.⁶ But with the widening scale of events its inconsiderable extent and remote situation in the south-eastern corner of Chinese Turkestan reduced its significance: from c. 445—c. 670 A.D. it played a part only as an appanage of the Tu-yu[k]-hun kingdom, of the Tsaidam and Koko-nor,

2 *T'oung-pao*, II. vi (1905), pp. 519-571 (*Wei-lüo*), viii (1907), pp. 149-234 (*Later Han Annals*).

3 See Chavannes, *Later Han Annals*, p. 172.

4 On the Chinese practice of so reviving old appellations, see Pelliot, *BEFEO.*, VI, p. 371, n. 2.

5 For the dating see Stein, *Serindia*, p. 426.

6 In 441 A.D. *Shan-shan* was occupied during a whole year by An-chou, a prince of the Pei-liang dynasty of Kan-su, which had ruled (from Sha-chou to Liang-chou) from c. 397-439 A.D., when it was overthrown by the Imperial Wei. An-chou's army, sent in advance of the proposed invasion of Kao-ch'ang by his brother Wu-hui, drove out the *Shan-shan* king Pi-lung and waited in the state capital, I-hsiu: see O. Franke, *Eine Chinesische Tempelinschrift*, pp. 17-8 (Berlin Academy *Sitzungsberichte*, 1907).

itself owning a loose allegiance to a Chinese power,⁷ and thenceforth only as a province of Tibetan (c. 670-1035), later of Tangutans (c. 1035-1226 A.D.), rule. Marco Polo found one 'large town,' no doubt on the site of the modern Carkhlik; but its inhabitants were Musalmans.⁸ Later the whole country, as far as its western border, became deserted; and it is doubtful whether the early population has left any descendants at all, the now existing settlements being all of modern origin and even the 'Lop-lik' fishing-people of the river reaches being immigrants, of Turkish speech.⁹

Modern interest in the country was primarily geographical, centred upon problems relating to desiccation and the situation and area of Lob-nor. There has supervened a keen archæological interest, kindled by explorations of desert sites, which have brought to light remains of a once-flourishing civilization. Suggested by Sir Sven Hedin's discovery of a desert site representing the ancient Chinese military colony of Lou-lan, the expeditions of Sir Aurel Stein, carried out with remarkable enterprize, endurance and insight, archaeological and geographical, have reconstructed, so to speak, the extinct civilization in many of its chief aspects, administrative, social, religious and artistic, and have recovered relics of utensils and fabrics used in common life. The finds also illustrate and amplify the historical information furnished by Chinese literature: and there are collections of flints, etc., from prehistoric periods. All these matters, with a full summary and discussion of the historical, geographical and topographical notices, have received masterly treatment and illustration in Sir Aurel Stein's personal narratives and lectures and in the splendid folio volumes of his three official reports, *Ancient Khotan*, *Serindia*, and *Innermost Asia*, with their accompanying volumes of plates and portfolios of maps.

In the Lou-lan colony, which is once or twice mentioned as a 'big town,'¹⁰ the interests and business were mainly Chinese; but even there were certainly native officials¹¹ and other residents and edifices of their religion, which was Buddhist. Elsewhere the Chinese seem to have been merely individual trading parties¹² or occasional officials: in general the government and administration was native. The predominant religion was Buddhism, and the religious archi-

7 In the year 676 A.D., on the occasion of the Emperor Kao-tsung's northern progress, Cer-cen received from the Chinese the new name (Sa-p'i) Po-hsien; see L. Giles, *BSOS.*, VI, p. 830.

8 See Yule's *Marco Polo*, ed. H. Cordier, I, pp. 196-7.

9 See Stein, *Serindia*, p. 335.

texture and art (both style and subjects) were in thorough conformity with the practice of the Indo-Hellenistic, 'Gandhāra,' art of the Indian north-western frontier regions: possibly in some cases of non-traditional portraiture there may be features reflecting native physiognomy.¹³ There are some remains of forts, Chinese, and, at a late period, Tibetan.

It is in the writings¹⁴ that the conditions most clearly reveal themselves. The materials and forms are for the most part of Chinese origin, being oblong (those with Indian script in many cases wedge-shaped) wooden slips, or squarer rectangles of wood or leather, or pieces of silk or paper, folded when containing letters;¹⁵ but there are some few leaves or fragments in Indian form and material, perhaps left by visitors in shrines. From Krorayina the bulk (c. 1000 items) consists of Chinese documents, calendars, letters, etc., with a relatively few fragments of literary works; here the interest is almost exclusively Chinese, though there are references to individual natives, in some cases officials, and foreigners of various races. The relatively few documents in Indian Kharoṣṭhī script and in an Indian Prākṛit dialect are likewise concerned with business. In the only other area of copious finds, namely the Niya river region in the extreme west of the kingdom, the proportion of Chinese to Indian is reversed: here the Indian items number about 700, while those in Chinese are some 10 or 12. These Indian pieces,

10 See *infra*, p. 8.

11 See Stein, *Serindia*, p. 380.

12 In the Kharoṣṭhī documents from Caḍota the 'Chinese' or individual Chinese are not infrequently mentioned (see Professor Rapson's Index): in no. 35 an arrival of traders from China is expected.

13 Sir A. Stein notes (*Serindia*, p. 507) a semi-Semitic appearance of some faces in the Mirān paintings.

14 The Chinese documents from Krorayina and Caḍota, the Stein collection, are edited by Chavannes in *Les Documents Chinois découverts par Aurel Stein*. (1913): some few also in *Ancient Khotan*, pp. 537-542. Others from Krorayina, Hedin collection, are edited by Conrady in *Die Chinesischen Inschriften und sonstigen Kleinfunde Sven Hedin in Lou-lan* (1920). The Kharoṣṭhī documents are edited in *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein—transcribed and edited by A.M. Boyer, E.J. Rapson and E. Senart (and P.S. Noble)* (1920-9): two small fragments are included in Conrady's work, and some further documents, *trouvailles* of Stein's third expedition, are edited by Dr. T. Burrow *BSOS.*, IX.

15 For studies of the forms and materials see Stein, *Serindia*, pp. 764-6, and Conrady, *op. cit.*, pp. 33-74.

rescripts, deeds, lists, accounts, letters, expose the administrative working of the state, the occupations and interests of the people and the epistolary usage in official and private communications: there are numerous directions for official procedures, records of legal transactions, lists and accounts, some few reports of religious concerns and a number of references to relations with foreign peoples, notably that of Khotan.¹⁶ Very important linguistically are some of the plentiful designations of office or function or class and the mass and system of personal names. The phraseology, legal and other, including elaborate forms of address, is for the most part idiomatically Indian.¹⁷ This current use of Indian script and language, by, say, 100 different writers, some of them quite minor officials, shows that in the period, say c. 150-350 A. D., of the Kharoṣṭhi documents the Indianization of the native life in Shan-shan was on a level with that in the states of Indo-China, namely Campā, Fu-nan, and Cambodia; equally with these Shan-shan may be regarded, along with the other states of Chinese Turkestan, as a part of 'Greater India'. As late as 400 A.D., the Buddhist pilgrim Fa-hsien could write¹⁸ that—

'The king of this country honours the law (of Buddha). There are some 4000 priests (sc. monks), all of the Little Vehicle belief. The laity and the Śramaṇas of this country wholly practise the religion of India, only some are refined and some coarse (in their observances). From this proceeding westward, the countries passed through are all alike in this respect, only the people differ in their language (*Hu words*). The professed disciples of Buddha, however, all use Indian books and the Indian language.'

Rapid acclimatization of a complete culture introduced from abroad has, of course, many instances. In Shan-shan, as in the Indo-Chinese countries, the earliest Indian influence may not have been Buddhist, but there and in Chinese Turkestan generally it seems to have become exclusively so. The strange fact that the early Chinese histories at a time when Buddhism was known in China itself never note anything Buddhist or Indian as existing in Turkestan exemplifies a perhaps essential difference between the Chinese expansion and the Indian, the former being political and well informed in practical

16 Cf. *Acta Orientalia*, XII, pp. 41-54.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 62-8.

18 See Beal, *Buddhist Records of the Western World*, I, p. xxiv; cf. Legge's translation of Fa-hsien, pp. 12-14.

matters, but indifferent to the psychology of the dominated or foreign peoples,* the latter propagandist and educative.

The ethnography of a long extinct population comprizing at the earliest known period, as Lou-lan, only 1570 families, 14,100 individuals, and, subsequently, as Shan-shan, never perhaps reaching 50,000, may be considered of slight interest. But the matter has wider bearings and raises questions in regard to the peopling of the numerous other statelets of Turkestan. Moreover, it presents itself in a relatively practical aspect which, being linguistic, may involve distant and ancient connections. For the interpretation of the mass of documents particularized above and for understanding the culture and history a view of the ethnic character and language of the people proves to be indispensable.

Here it should be premised that the expanded Shan-shan state may not have been at first ethnically or linguistically uniform. The territories acquired from about the middle of the 1st century A.D., may have been at a different level of culture; and the circumstance that the mass of the records comes from those territories, when not from the Chinese military colony, may mislead. It is, however, clear from the excavations at Mirān, where, or in which vicinity, was the capital of the original small state, that in course of time, at any rate, things had evened out: and any discrimination, if such is to be made, could come only at the end, not at the beginning, of the inquiry. With a view to clarity, however, we may distinguish (1), by the name *Lou-lan*, the original state, both before and after its rebaptism by the Chinese, (2), by the name *Shan-shan*, the enlarged kingdom, resulting from the expansions after c. 60 A.D., (3) by the well-attested form *Krorayīna*, the Chinese military colony of Lou-lan, founded some years later than 119 A.D.

Concerning Lou-lan the *Former Han Annals*, compiled from official records extending down to c. 25 A.D., states as follows¹⁹ :—

‘The soil is sandy and salt. There is accordingly little tillage, and people are consequently dependent upon the agriculture of the adjoining kingdoms, whence it is sought to procure grain.

The kingdom produces jasper (jade), and there are there abundance of reeds, tamarisks and willows, *Katalpas* [probably a kind of poplar] and white herbage.

The people with their herds of cattle seek out the places with water and vegetation. There are in the country asses and

19 See Wylie, *op. cit.*, p. 25; De Groot, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

horses and many camels. People understand how to manufacture weapons, and these are similar to those of the Jo (Dža, Ni)-ch'iang.'

This description of a semi-nomadic people, practising agriculture only in a few places where the ground was not excessively sandy or salt-impregnated does not preclude the existence of some 'towns.' The same account mentions strongholds and a capital, Yü-ni, residence of the king; also in the centre of the kingdom, in a fertile area, a 'town' I-hsün or I-hsiu, where in 77 B.C. the Chinese established a military colony and subsequently maintained a 'Commandant-general' (*tu-wei*). Furthermore, there must always have been, as Sir Aurel Stein cogently argues,²⁰ an important settlement in the region of the modern Carkhlik, favoured by a relatively extensive cultivable area and by its situation in regard to a probably ancient tricle of communication with the Tsaidam and Koko-nor regions of north-eastern 'Tibet.' Later we find it stated that here in Han times was the actual capital, the real bearer of the name 'Lou-lan.'²¹

We must here studiously avoid some much discussed topographical questions²² relating to the three places and retain only the generally accepted identifications of (1) I-hsün, or I-hsiu, with the place known in Tibetan times as 'Little Nob' and with the Mirān site, (2) of Ch'i-t'un, the place of the 'Seven Military Colonies,' as either actually at I-hsün or in its vicinity,²³ (3) Shih-ch'êng, 'Stone-town,' mentioned in T'ang times as corresponding to the old Lou-lan town with Carkhlik Hsüan-tsang's *Na-fu-po* and the Tibetan 'Great Nob.' As to whether the original capital, Yü-ni, was actually at I-hsün/I-hsiu and not somewhat further north and nearer to the Tarim embouchure into Lob-nor,²⁴ whether the capital was ever in fact at Carkh-

20 *Serindia*, pp. 311-3, 475 n.

21 See Beal, *op.cit.*, II, p. 325.

22 It may be sufficient to refer to Stein's *Serindia*, pp. 320-3, 326-8, where are references to discussions by Grenard, Chavannes, Herrmann and Pelliot: add, however, the observations of Dr. L. Giles in *BSOS*, VI, pp. 823-830.

23 It is likely that 'Seven military colonies' involves an error and that the site was that of the original military colony of 77 B.C.: see Pelliot, *Journal Asiatique*, XI. vii (1916), p. 116. In *JRAS.*, 1928, p. 590, 1934, p. 96, it has been pointed out that *Ch'i-t'un* is perhaps a corruption of the native name, in Tibetan writing *Se-ton* and *Rtse-thon*, of a place where was the royal residence of the subsequent Tu-yu (k)-hun rulers of Shan-shan: that place will have been adjacent to the capital, I'hsün.

24 It seems possible that Yü-ni, stated apparently (see Stein, *Serindia*,

lik or was named Lou-lan, we may suspend judgment. What is certain is that Krorayina, though a 'big town,' and an important Chinese station, was never the state capital.²⁵

The ruling persons in the state, listed in the *Former Han Annals* according to its practice, were—

- (1) 1 'Vassal-chief, support of the state' (*fu-kuo*);
- (2) 1 'Vassal-chief for repelling the *Hu*' (i.e. in this case, clearly, Hsiung-nu barbarians);
- (3) 1 'Commandant-general (*tu-wei*) for Shan-shan';
- (4) 1 'Commandant-general for war-measures against Chü-shih';
- (5) 1 'Right' and 'Left *Ch'ieh-chü*';
- (6) 1 'Chief for war-measures against Chü-shih' ('Smite-Chü-shih chief');
- (7) 2 'Head-Interpreters,'

This list, ethnographically not very instructive, may be historically misleading. No. (3) is probably the above-mentioned Chinese 'commandant-general' at I-hsün/I-hsiu. No. (2) the commander against the Hsiung-nu, paralleled in several others of the states, and nos. (4) and (6), who operate against the more or less contiguous state of Chü-shih, are no doubt, of Chinese instigation, since in pre-Chinese times the states did not resist the Hsiung-nu, and with Chü-shih, except when it was coöperating with the Hsiung-nu against the Chinese, Lou-lan had no quarrel. The Chinese originals of the titles have in general no specially local significance; but it is noticeable that no. (1), who would be the king himself, honoured by the Chinese with the title 'Vassal-chief,' has in his attribute, 'support of the state (*fu-kuo*),' the original of the subsequent Prākṛit-Kharoṣṭhī expression *raja-dharag'a*=Sanskrit *rājyadhāraka*. The 'Head-Interpreters,' in Lou-lan and most of the other states, may have

p. 326), to be on the lake at the embouchure of the river, was rather in the vicinity of the present fishing village of Abal, which has always been an important place of passage for travellers and whence in modern times (*Serindia*, pp. 349-350) Mirān was recolonized.

²⁵ In Kharoṣṭhī documents No 678 the 'great town' (*mahanta nagara*) clearly is Krorayina; but elsewhere (nos. 5,155,250,296) there is an addition of 'at the king's gate' (*rayadvarammi*), and the reference must be to the capital, known from positive statement (see L. Giles, *op.cit.*, p. 829), as well as from the above-noted occupation by An-chou's expedition, to have been at I'hsün/I-hsiu. A glance at Sir A. Stein's map suffices to show that Krorayina, a Chinese junction settlement far away in the desert to the north-east, can never have been the capital.

resulted from diversities of language in Chinese Turkestan itself, but may as well have been due to the development of the transit trade.

This single non-Chinese term *ch'ieh-chü*, which previously (*Acta Orientalia*, XIII, p. 75) has been equated to the *cojhbö* of the Kharoṣṭhī documents may require reconsideration²⁶ in view of its occurrence at an earlier date as a Hsiung-nu official title. It might be a relic of the domination by that people, unless it is merely an ancient instance of the borrowing of titles (*yabgu*, *kagan*, *tu-tuq*, *tegin*, *cigši*, etc.) prevalent at later periods in Central Asia. For 'Right' and 'Left' a Hsiung-nu derivation would suggest the meanings 'West' and 'East.'

Among the states in touch with Lou-lan the first place belongs to that of Chü-shih, the Guchen-Turfan region of the easternmost T'ien-shan. The two were certainly not contiguous, except in the sense that there was nothing between: to the south of Chü-shih the great Sho-na desert extended to the now absolutely barren Kuruk-tāgh range of mountains, south of which again the Lou-lan territory, even if it extended so far to the north of the Tarim river, was likewise mainly desert, though probably less desiccated and eroded than at present.²⁷ But communications over the Kuruk-tāgh were, as Sir Aurel Stein has shown, more feasible than they now are; and their actuality is proved by the fact that in the early period of Chinese penetration Chü-shih and Lou-lan were always, in the fluctuations of pressure from the Hsiung-nu and the Chinese, either acting together on the one side or the other or driven into mutual conflict. The actual first pretext for Chinese military intervention in Chü-shih and Lou-lan was an accusation of the two states jointly as having molested the early Chinese communications with the Western Countries.²⁸

On the north-west there will have been some natural intercourse with the line of statelets (Shan/Mo-shan=Singer?; Wei-li, on the Konche river; Wei-hsü=Khorla) adjoining the 'northern route,'²⁹ the course of which was dictated by the reaches of the Kuruk and Konche rivers on their way to join the Tarim, and which linked the

26 See *infra*, p. 32.

27 On the Sho-na desert and increased desiccation of the Kuruk-tāgh and the region to its south, see *Serindia*, pp. 707-8, 1155 n. 334, 407-8.

28 See Wylie, *op.cit.*, pp. 25-7, De Groot, *op.cit.*, pp. 55, 57.

29 Wylie, *op.cit.*, p. 101, De Groot, *op.cit.*, pp. 154-5, 163-4, Stein, *Serindia*, pp. 333-4, 1230-2.

country to Khorla (for Karashahr) and Kuca. In Chinese times it was, of course, a great route. The western boundary of Lou-lan consisted of the terminal marshes of the Tarim and Cer-cen rivers, behind which stretched the main extent of the impassable, central, Taklamakan desert. South of the Cer-cen river the desert of c. 198 miles in width, which is the first stage of the 'southern route,' is, as flanked by the river, not formidable.³⁰ Near the southward bend of the river was the comparatively large oasis of Calmada/Cer-cen, which itself communicated with the northern statelets by a route curving round the eastern part of the desert and skirting the Lou-lan boundary.³¹

Calmada the western neighbour of Lou-lan, was culturally a mid-way point. In the *Former Han Annals* the account of Shan-shan ends with the statement that—

'Shan-shan lies on the Han road [sc. the great southern route]. Westward to Cer-cen is 720 li (c. 150 miles). From Cer-cen onwards the five cereals are everywhere cultivated, and soil and vegetation, animal-rearing, industries and war-measures are like those in Han [China]. What is different will be specified.'

That Calmada was not quite on a level of culture with the oasis settlements on the rivers further west, from which it was separated by a broad space of difficult sand desert,³² appears from the remark of the Buddhist envoy Sung-yün, who concerning its population of c. 100 (in Former Han times 230) families, says³³ that—

'They know not the use of oxen or ploughs in their husbandry.'

The above considerations would render intelligible the expansion of the Lou-lan kingdom as far west as Calmada and would confirm a view, if otherwise maintainable, that in the further westward extension as far as the Niya river the state absorbed a population of a somewhat superior culture and possibly distinct race. But that is not here propounded.

30 Particulars of route in Grenard, *Mission Dutreuil de Rhins*, III, p. 219; account of journey, Stein, *Serindia*, pp. 304-6; *Desert Cathay*, I, pp. 326 sqq.

31 On this route see *Serindia*, p. 420, *Innermost Asia*, p. 765.

32 See Beal, *op.cit.*, II, pp. 324-5, for Hsüan-tsang's account: details in Grenard, *op.cit.*, III; pp. 218-9.

33 Beal, *op. cit.*, I, p. lxxxv, Chavannes, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, III, p. 391.

On the east Lou-lan was separated from the Chinese border in Kan-su, with its important military garrison town, Tun-huang/Sha-chou and the smaller settlement of Shou-ch'ang (now Nan-hu), some 80 li (c. 16 miles) further west, by the really formidable Kum desert, which could well have constituted an ethnical barrier. There were, however, two routes, very long (c. 300 miles) and toilsome, of communication, the one following partly the southern shore of Lop-nor and ultimately reaching Tun-huang, the other, south of the desert, winding rather high up round the slopes of the barren mountains and descending to Shou-ch'ang/Nan-hu, where the river Tang ho debouches, and so to Tun-huang/Sha-chou.³⁴

The valley of the Tang-ho was, and is, a route from western Kan-su over the great, snow-crowned, Altyn-tāgh range of mountains to the Tsaidam of north-eastern 'Tibet,' which was the main habitat of the Jo (Dža-ch'iang) people who had also, as has been mentioned, some fairly easy descents in the region of Carkhlik. The same people was, as the *Former Han Annals* reports plainly from local information at each point, regarded by the Turkestanis as furnishing the population (which must have been extremely sparse) of the 'Tibetan,' southern, side not only of the Altyn-tāgh, but of the whole great mountain barrier, the Kuen-lun, at least as far west as the longitude of Khotan. But also on the northern, Turkestan, side they were found by the Chinese immediately to the west of the Yang barrier at Shou-ch'ang (Nan-hu). It is denied that any groups of people on the long mountain route to Carkhlik were likewise Jo (Dža)-ch'iang; but at Carkhlik they extended even across the high road and they also bordered on Calmada/Cer-cen and the mountain state of Hsiao-wan, to the south thereof.³⁵ This is not the limit: for according to testimony which we need not here consider, since we are carefully leaving out of sight the country west of Shan-shan, there were

34 On these routes and distances see Stein, *Serindia*, pp. 549 sqq.

35 These particulars concerning the Jo-ch'iang are mostly stated in the main account: see Wylie, *op.cit.*, p. 23, De Groot, *op.cit.*, pp. 52-3, and also Chavannes in *T'oung-pao*, II, vi (1905), pp. 526, n. 8, where the statement concerning extension across the high road differs from the translation of De Groot. The fact of bordering on Cer-cen and its southern neighbour may imply that the later Vāshshahri, between Charkhlik and Cer-cen, was originally a Jo-ch'iang station. The extension of the Jo-ch'iang along the whole hinterland south of the mountains is displayed in old Chinese maps also and in that accompanying Professor Herrmann's *Die Seidenstrassen*.

remnants of Ch'iang, if not of Jo(Dza)-ch'iang, people in the southern mountains even as far west as the Karakoram and the Pamir.

The general upshot is that there was one only people, namely the Jo(Dza)-ch'iang, known to have been in any close contact with the Lou-lan population, and that this contact existed along the whole southern border of the state and was in part intimate. If we were inclined to suppose an ethnical affinity between the two long extinct peoples, objection on the ground of physical type is obviously inapplicable. Even should we find in the ancient hunter temporarily exhumed by Sir Aurel Stein in the far north of the Krorayina region and photographed and discussed in *Innermost Asia*, pp. 264-6, photograph 173, a Lou-lan physical type, neither his physiognomy nor the mode of burial would be inconsistent with a Ch'iang affinity. Among the Tibetan-speaking people of north-eastern 'Tibet' the physical type, is, as Mr. Joyce has suspected,³⁶ not that commonly recognized as 'Tibetan'; and the same may be said concerning peoples of eastern Tibet and other Tibeto-Burmans of the Sino-Tibetan borderlands. This is attested by statements of travellers, who refer to aquilinity of nose, straight eyes, absence of the 'Mongol fold' or prominent cheek-bones, and in some cases exceptionally tall stature.³⁷ Concerning the mode of burial also something might be adduced.

Nevertheless, the fact that the Chinese evidently regard the Lou-lan people, despite similarity of culture and actual intercourse, as distinct from the Jo(Dza)-ch'iang is not negligible; and that the Ch'iang, like the Tibetans, were people of the mountains and high plateaux, whereas the Lou-lan people belonged to the plains, may have an ethnical significance. Hence a solution of the problem not to be found in the geographical and historical situation, must be sought in the written indications and the language. A systematic study of the material could not yet be contemplated: but we may consider some relevant particulars.

1. *The territorial system and the general administration*

From the numerous communications addressed in the king's name to administrators in Caḍota, whence comes the bulk of the Prākṛit material,—with one or two, of similar tenour, from Krorayina—it is evident that the central authority exercised a close control and

³⁶ See *Serindia*, p. 1361 (4).

³⁷ See Przevalsky, *Mongolia* (trans. E.D. Morgan), II, p. 110, Rookhill, *Journey through Mongolia, etc.*, p. 234, *Land of the Lamas*, p. 74, Bonvalot, *Across Tibet* (trans.), I, p. 80, II, pp. 8, 97.

frequently interposed even in minor matters: the system was not feudal or federal. Nevertheless a trace of prior local independence may be detected in the use of the term *rājya*, 'kingly rule,' 'kingdom,' in the sense of 'administration,' 'sphere of administration.' Thus in no. 272, a royal rescript to a *cojhbo* posted in Caḍota, we find the expressions *tusya rajiye* 'in your (singular) kingdom (sc. administration province),' and *tumahu rajammi*, 'in your (plural) kingdom,' the latter recurring also in no. 229 and perhaps again in no. 109. Analogous phrases are—

adehi rajade, 'from the there (= where you are) kingdom' (nos. 164, 223)

tatrema rajammi, 'in that same kingdom' (no. 40)

Caḍota-raja, 'the Caḍota kingdom,' (no. 415).

In a number of instances it becomes accordingly disputable whether *raja* and *rajya* (=Sanskrit *rājya*) unspecified denote the Shan-shan kingdom as a whole or a particular province; and a partly analogous doubt may arise in regard to the use of the adjective *rayaka*, 'royal.' The alternative is explicit in—

bahi rajade rajarajade, 'from outside administration(s) [and]

from kingdom (sc. central) administration(s)' (No. 714)

where the context precludes the renderings 'foreign' and 'home.' In no. 31 *para raja* may signify not 'foreign kingdom,' but merely 'other province.' In accord with this use of *raja* (*rājya*) the provincial heads of administrations are entitled *rajadharaga*, 'kingdom (or rule)-holding,' a rendering, as we have seen, of the Chinese *fu-kuo*; and matters and persons connected with the administration are *rajad-(dh)areya* (Sanskrit *rājyadhāreya*): examples—

rajadaraga mahatva, 'administrative heads' (no. 120);

rajadareya mahatva, id. (no. 582. cf. no. 637);

yaṃ kalammi tuo cojhbo Tamjaka rājadhārāga hudesi, 'at what time you, *cojhbo* Tamjaka, were (or became) administration-holder' (no. 625).

If it should be suggested (as in *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, p. 45) that this use of the term *rājya*, 'kingly rule,' was a survival from the period when Caḍota was an independent state, that would perhaps not conflict with the sense of the word *cojhbo*, which does not seem to have connoted any special function. This appears from the use of the plural in application to two persons of whom the second was probably not a *cojhbo* in any technical sense: we find, e.g.—

cojhboana Kranaya Lpipeyaṣa ca (no. 88)

cojhboana Yitaka Vuktoṣa ca (no. 576).

But in addresses—

cojhbo Kṛanaya soṭhamgha Lpipeyaṣa ca (nos. 19, etc.)

cojhbo Yitaka tomga Vuktoṣa ca (nos. 3, etc.)

Lpipeya is not styled *cojhbo* and has the distinct official designation *soṭhamgha*, and similarly Vukto is not a *cojhbo*, but a *tomga*. It is to be inferred that *cojhbo* was a title, not of office, but of dignity, 'my lord' rather than 'governor,' and so could be applied to high officials generally. If so, the usage is markedly similar to that of *jo-co*, *jo-bo*, *co-jo*, and the apparently equivalent *rtse-rje*, 'head chief,' in the same country some c. 400 years later, namely in letters to Tibetan officials. The persons are sometimes addressed with definite titles, 'Councillor,' 'Home Minister,' etc., only, but sometimes with *jo-co*, etc., either preceding these or in substitution for them.

It is, however, certain that the local *cojhbo*'s or 'great *cojhbo*'s' (no. 585, *maha-cojhbo*) did not hold office by virtue of hereditary relation to originally independent chiefs: they were appointees of the central government—

ekisya etaṣa raja picavidemi

'to him (*cojhbo* Somjaka) singly I have committed the administration' (No. 272)

and the phrase *varṣavarṣi rajadhāreyaṇa*, 'year-by-year administrators', (No. 637) may indicate that in theory the appointments were for a single year.

Furthermore, in addresses and also in other lists the *cojhbo* is sometimes preceded by other ranks, which therefore are of higher consideration. In joint addresses *Kori Viryavaṃta* (nos. 40, 64) and *Cuvalayina Malbhuta* (no. 55) are so preferred; and elsewhere a like precedence is accorded to *Kori Rutraya* (no. 49), *K. Togaja* (no. 570), *Cuvalayina Puṃṇavaṃta* (no. 517), and c. *Tiraphara* (nos. 582, 732), sometimes along with *ogu*'s, *caṃkura*'s, *guṣura*'s, etc., who obviously belong to the central regime. The *Kori*'s (pl. in no. 692) and *Cuvalayina*'s are therefore superior ranks in their local residence, the latter, but probably not also the former, term, connoting certain functions.

A frequently mentioned subdivision is the 'hundred' (*śata*), noted in the edition (Index) with reference to Sir A. Stein's *Serindia*, p. 65, where attention has been drawn to Colonel Trotter's account of the three *sad*'s of Wakhan, which are administrative divisions, each of 100 houses.³⁸ In Shan-shan the 'hundreds' attested in Kro-

38 See Forsyth, *Mission to Yarkund*, p. 276.

rayina as well as in Caḍota, are uniformly mentioned as 'X's *sata*'; and Dr. Burrow (*The Language*....., pp. 97, 124-5) has satisfactorily explained the Prākṛit appellation *śataṇṇa* (Sanskrit equivalent unascertained), as denoting the person in charge of a *śata*; the *daśa-ṇṇa*, frequently mentioned in connection with *śatas*, but also elsewhere in obvious connection with '10,' he equally well explains as one in charge of a 'Ten,' and in no. 170, unless *daśaṇṇi* is a mistake for *śadaṇṇi*, the 'Ten,' itself is cited.

To what do these numbers refer? In *Tibetan Literary Texts and Documents*, I, pp. 282 sqq., and previously in *J.R.A.S.*, 1928, p. 563, 1934, pp. 96-7, the Tibetan system of 'thousand-districts,' (*ston-sde*) under 'thousand-commanders' (*ston-dpon*), also '10,000 districts,' has been described and shown to have existed during Tibetan times in the Western Kan-su also and the Shan-shan area. But the matter has much wider bearings: it may be said that a system of 'thousands,' 'hundreds,' etc., existed among most of the 'barbarian' peoples of Central Asia with which the Chinese came successively into contact. The earliest recorded example is that of the Hsiung-nu, c. 200 B.C., with their 24 commanders of 10,000, who severally appointed their own commanders of 1,000's, 100's and 10's. The Sien-pi Tu-yu[k]-hun had commanders of 1000's and 100's. One of the Pamir states has inherited from Turk times an official hierarchy of *mingbāshī*, *yūzbāshī*, *onbāshī*, which, however, may be the ordinary military ranks.³⁹

The unit may have varied from case to case, being in the case of nomads tents, elsewhere houses, in both cases households or families. That in the states of Chinese Turkestan some such system prevailed during the earliest recorded period is evident from the statistics of families and persons given in the *Former Han Annals*, the number of persons being commonly an exact multiple, oftenest by 7, sometimes by 6 or 8, of the number of families, and accordingly an estimate. The number primarily known to the Government was therefore that of households: and the like will have been the case in Shan-shan. In *Acta Orientalia*, XIII. pp. 52-4, it has been proposed to understand the appellation *tomgha* in the Prākṛit documents as equivalent to the (non-Tibetan) *stom-gyañ* of the Tibetan and meaning 'thousand-man', which would yield a likely etymology of *tom*, *stom*, = Tibetan *ston*, '1000', Tokhari *tmām*, '10,000', Tibeto-Burman Hsi-hsia tu, '1000', Turk *toman*, '10,000'. This would harmonize with the fact that in no. 96 are mentioned 9 *tomghas* at

³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 99.

Caḍota, six of them as supplying c. 20 men each: also the *tomghas*, who in the small states will not have been very numerous, were sufficiently important for one or other of them (e.g. *Vukto* in nos. 11, 23, 28, etc.) to be sometimes addressed in royal missives along with the *cojho* and to have subordinates (*vaṭhayaga*, nos. 357, 387, 622).

With the 'hundreds' are associated 'districts' (*prateja*, etc. = Sanskrit *pradeśa*), prevalently (e.g. in nos. 41, 173) in such a way that in lists of things or persons in, or from, a number of 'hundreds' one *pradeśa*, sometimes two, but usually a relatively small number of *pradeśas*, is included, being on the average level of a single 'hundred' in respect of the number or quantity of the items mentioned as in, or from, them. Elsewhere *pradeśas* occur in their own lists. There seems to be no instance of a 'district' containing a 'hundred'; but frequently persons in charge of 'tens' are mentioned. It follows that the 'districts' were outside the 'hundreds'; and since the latter will obviously belong to the more thickly populated town-areas, it follows that the districts were sub-urban, or country, areas, with sparser population. They are nearly always cited as 'X's *pradeśa*, where X, in one or two instances indentifiable with a *tomgha* X, may be rather an official than a landowner. Possibly however, the contrary is to be inferred from the frequent association of *vasus* with *avana*'s and *ḥilme*'s.

As explained in *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, pp. 63-4, the *avana*'s, *avana*'s (Sanskrit *āpaṇa*), were 'markets', being villages usually almost entirely uninhabited except on market-days, a feature still widely characteristic of Chinese Turkestan, and also of Kan-su and other parts of China.⁴⁰ That there was no Turkestan word *avana* meaning simply 'village' has been proved elsewhere. The special character of the *avana*'s is manifested by their appellations which predominantly refer to their chief traffic, e.g. *Yave-avana*, (grain) 'barley-market', *ajiyama* (*ajima*)-*avana*, 'butter etc. (Sanskrit *ājya*)-market', *trasa-avana*, 'live-animals (Sanskrit *trasa*)-market', and perhaps *petava-avana*, 'sheep (Sanskrit *petvan*)-market': similarly in India we have 'edibles-market', 'garland-market' (*bhaḥṣya-mālya-āpaṇa*). It cannot,

40 For a lively description see Forsyth, *ibid.*, pp. 62-3: in greater brevity we read (p. 254), 'nearly all the villages I have seen in East Turkestan, consisting of a number of small hamlets, scattered about the plain. Each hamlet consists of a number of scattered farmhouses. In a central position is the bazar, with long rows of stalls on both sides of the road, somewhat resembling that of an Indian village, but absolutely untenanted except on the weekly market-day.'

however, be proved from the documents that the *avana's* were in practice restricted to any particular products, nor was it to be expected that they should be so. Nor could cultivation in the vicinity of the *avana's* be unusual; and in fact the distribution of tillage in connection with them is several times pointedly in question, the best example being in no. 713, where a certain Vasu is accused of holding up lands in the *ajima-avana*.

The *kilmi's* or *kilme's* (Adjective *kilmici*, *kilmeci*, *kilmemci*, 'person of a *kilmi*, *kilme*') and the persons belonging to them are normally (e.g. nos. 16, 32, 254, 279, 297, 393, 422, 431-2, 468, 474, 495, 581, 621-2) connected with *avana's*. But sometimes the *kilme's* (nos. 256, 358, 482) or *kilmeci* are mentioned as belonging to some individual, usually an important person (in no. 38 a head of a monastery, *vihāra-pāla*); and in one instance (no. 374) a distinction is made between the tax paid from the *rājya* (sc. the public lands, etc.) and that from the *kilmeci's*. It might therefore be that the *kilmeci's* were serfs of rich men, working on their local estates; and certainly in connection with farmlands (nos. 713, 734), winecrops (nos. 358, 431) and sheep or cattle (no. 519). Some speciality is indicated by the statement that men do duty in the 'hundred,' women in the *kilme*—

*puruṣa jaṃma śataṃmi dharma kareṃti, striyana*⁴¹ *kilmi dharma kareṃti* (no. 46)

Furthermore, we find (nos. 165, 211, 714) the expression '*vega* (*vega-kilmi* women,' and (no. 481) '*vega-kilme* duty (*dharma*)' on the part of a woman. It has been suggested (*Acta Orientalia*, XIII, p. 63) that the *vega-kilme* work was connected with irrigation, but that depends upon an etymology.

No help is afforded by deriving *kilme* (Dr. Burrow, *JRAS.*, 1935, pp. 673-5) from the 'Tokhari' word *kälyme*, taken in the sense of 'district.' Not to mention that *kälyme* is attested at a date some c. 400-500 years later than *kilme*, its meaning is not 'district' (Sanskrit *deśa*), but 'point of the compass' (Sanskrit *diś*), in which sense it constantly recurs, so that, but for a suitable etymology propounded by the editors,⁴² it might be suspected of being a loan-word = Greek *klima* in its geographical sense. The fact that the *kilme*-people were freely moved about (no. 639) and that they were so often dependants of important persons at the centre, e.g. Kala (prince) Pūmñabala (no. 331), K. Kuṣṣuda (no. 307), Ogu (noble) Pūmñayaśa (no.

41 Irregular syntax, not unexampled.

42 *Tocharische Grammatik*, by E. Sieg and W. Siegling in conjunction with W. Schulze, §4, b.

209), O. Aśoga (nos. 254, 621), O. Viharavala (no. 393), O. Ajhuraka (no. 639), O. Bhimasenā (no. 734), and the fact that the *kilme*'s themselves were so often attached to *avana*'s suggest that the *kilme*'s were not permanent establishments at all, but encampments of retainers of great men sent out for profitable, seasonal, employment as cultivators, harvesters, gleaners, and for other work (in no. 621 a *kilmeci* is a potter, *kulala*): the case of the *chun-pa*'s, 'field workers,' etc., in Tibetan times may have been similar.

Many of the documents are concerned with *palpi* and the remitting of it to the central government: the term covers a variety of objects, such as animals (camels, etc.), corn, ghee, textiles, *cāmdrikamṃta*, etc., and there are several references to *palpi-dharma*, 'the (customary) law of *palpi*'. That *palpi* was equivalent to 'tax' was stated in *Acta Orientalia* XIII, pp. 46, 62-3, and the same meaning was adopted by Dr. Burrow⁴³ with a revised transcription *palyi* in place of the editors' *palpi*. Dr. Burrow was thus able to make out a case for identifying the word with Sanskrit *bali*, the *p* being attributed to local pronunciation: and this view, which certainly is recommended by the lack, down to the present, of any suitable alternative, was shared by Professor Lüders,⁴⁴ who, however, has since,⁴⁵ by identifying the word with the *pali* (*chin[n]a*) of the Mathurā Lion Capital Inscription of much earlier date, virtually renounced the proposed explanation of the *p*. However, the meaning is sure.

The fact that in no. 714, as noted in *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, pp. 5-6 and n. 2, three classes of persons, namely *Vasu*'s or *Vasu*'s, *Ageta*'s and *Yatma*'s, from all the provinces are required to repair annually to court for inquiry into the taxation law groups the three classes as interested in taxation. The understanding of the *Vasu*'s or *Vasu*'s as landowners, or at least persons of considerable standing, is clear in general from the manner of their precedence and also from particular references: for instance, in no. 25 a *Vasu* is addressed by *Kala* (Prince) *Kunala*, in no. 622 by *Kala* (Prince) *Puṃṇabala*, and in no. 393 *Kori Rutraya*, who usually is of higher consideration than a *cojbho*, is '*Vasu K. R.*' Moreover, in a majority of instances where a particular *Vasu* is concerned the matter relates to transactions in some *avana*, = village as defined. It is therefore probable that *Vasu* was landlord, or other head, of a

⁴³ *JRAS.* 1935, p. 675; cf. p. 670.

⁴⁴ *BSOS.*, VIII, pp. 637, sqq.

⁴⁵ *Acta Orientalia*, XVIII (1939), p. 16.

village: without immediate etymological implication we may compare the term *Spa*, applied in Tibetan times to local magnates in the Khotan region.⁴⁶ Of the *yatma* we can say for certain that he was concerned with corn (nos. 146, 349, 430, 439), its collection into store-houses (*draṅga*, no. 272), and its despatch (nos. 305, 307); but he also collects and conveys other dues (*palpi*, nos. 275, 374), and is mentioned, moreover, (nos. 23, 546), as despatching camels. The *ageta*, since he is often *vasu-ageta* or *yatma-ageta* and seems to partake of the functions of the *Vasu* or *Yatma*, may have been in either case the 'subordinate,' 'deputy' or 'agent': his title may be the native equivalent of the Prakrit *vaṭhayaga* (Sanskrit *upasthāyaka*), the name of an official who, like the *ageta*, is sometimes mentioned along with his employer (*Aya Ridhaṣeṇaṣa* v., no. 419, *Kitsaitsaṣa* v., no. 579, *raya* v., no. 576, *toṃgha* v., no. 622) and sometimes (e.g. nos. 189, 581, 637) without such specification.

The only other local official needing mention may be the *ṣoṭhaṃgha*. That this officer was primarily in charge of a *draṅga*, 'granary,' 'store,' etc., is evident in nos. 272, 520, 567, and has been stated in *Acta Orientalia*, XII, p. 45 n. 2, XIII, p. 62; but he seems also to have controlled the supply of camels for travel and transport. The etymology of the word as mentioned in the edition (Index) cannot be maintained: as pointed out by Professor Bailey (*B.S.O.S.*, VIII, p. 905), the word must certainly be connected with 'Tokhari' *ṣoṣ-taṅka*, denoting some officials who are not ministers (*amātya*). If related to Sanskrit *śruṣ*, *śruṣṭi*, *śrauṣṭi*, 'obey,' 'obedience,' 'obedient,' it implies merely loyal service, and has no special significance in regard to Shan-shan. In case the personal name *Śrustinga* (no. 593)

46 A Saka-Khotani spelling *spāta*, understood as *spādapati*, 'army-commander,' seems to have led Professor Bailey, *BSOS*. VIII (1935-7), pp. 934-5, to attribute to *spa* a military signification and to translate *spāta* by 'General.' Whether a form *spāta* would have been practically possible in use as a derivative of *spādapati* a non-Iranist could hardly consider. But one may ask why, if the *t* is real, it is not written *tt*? If it is what Leumann called the hiatus-removing *t*, which is in fact the case as regards the *spāta* cited by Professor Konow in *Saka Studies*, p. 182- (see the Hoernle document there cited and the accompanying Plate), why should not *spata* be one of the fanciful Saka-Khotani spellings and represent merely *spā*? This is suggested by the fact that nothing military appears in the Tibetan contexts where *spa* occurs and, far more decidedly, by the Tibetan translation of *spā* cited by Professor Bailey. *Sde-dpon* is not a military term: it regularly denotes the civil head of a district.

belongs to the group the dental *t* might point to a co-operation of the Iranian (Zend) equivalents *šraosha*, 'obedience,' *asrushti*, 'disobedience.' It is, however, not certain that the initial *š* of *šoṭhamgha* is derived from *śr*, and the definite character of the *šoṭhamgha*'s functions is adverse.

II. Material Objects and Animals

There have been ingenious and fruitful studies of unfamiliar terms in the Prākṛit denoting such things as agricultural and other country products and procedures, textiles, articles of dress, weapons and other fabricated goods, measures and weights, legal, epistolary and other usages and expressions. From the nature of the case the success consists in tracing the terms to Indian, Iranian and other outside sources, and the things themselves may practically all belong to an imported culture, at least as regards Lou-lan. Native terms, if any, would be problematic.

We might expect to find native, or at least local, names for the jasper (jade), reeds, tamarisks, willows, Katalpas and white herbage credited to Lou-lan in the *Former Han Annals*. But such have not been found. It may be suspected indeed that the word *haṣga*, which in no. 297 denotes something that should be forwarded to the king and the giving out of which is, as also in no. 751, an offence, and a gift of which is in no. 542 a subject of accusation, should be the precious jade, *jaspis*, in Chinese *yü*. In the Turki form *kash* the name of the stone is borne by the Khotan rivers *Karakāsh* and *Yurungkāsh*: allied forms are known in Mongol, etc., and others possibly connected are found even in ancient Hebrew, Greek *iaspis*, etc.⁴⁷ It follows from this that *haṣga*, even if current in Shan-shan, may have been not native in Shan-shan, but imported in the Prākṛit. The expression *cāṇdri-kaṃmānta* (nos. 272, 714), taken in *Acta Orientalia*, XII, p. 46 n. 3. as signifying jade, consists of two words, in Sanskrit, *cāndrī* and *kaṃmānta* (with loss of *r*. due to dissimilation from the preceding syllable, *dri*), meaning respectively 'moonlight' and 'working,' the latter the regular term, in the *Kauṭaliya-Arthaśāstra* and elsewhere, for industrial operations. The reference to jade is not a speculation, but is based, as was alleged, upon the unchallengeable Chinese statement regarding Khotan that—

47 On jade in China and its names see Abel-Rémusat, *Histoire de la ville de Khotan*, pp. 199-240, esp. pp. 124-132; Yule-Cordier *Marco polo*, I, p. 193. Dr. Laufer's *Jade* (1912) is not largely linguistic.

'there is there a river [containing] jade. The people of the country watch during the night the spots where the reflection of the moon is intense and do not fail to find there fine jade.'

The names of the common animals, ox, sheep, horse, ass, dog, etc., are all Prākṛit, or at least Indo-Iranian, and accordingly un-instructive. Even the camel, native in Lou-lan and in the wild state still found in the Kum desert and the high Altyn-tāgh valleys, is always given his Prākṛit name (*uṭa*, *uṭha*), never even an Iranian form. Some obscure epithets are found applied to the camel, among which *akṛa* (or *kṛa*, *ḱṛa*) *tsa* or *amḱ*⁴⁸, also (in no. 590) *akṛa* (*kṛa*, *ḱṛa*) simply, is equated by Dr. Burrow (*JRAS*, 1935, p. 67', *The Language*..., pp. 71, 106), to a 'Tokhari' word *ākṇats*, *ākṇātsa*, meaning 'unknown', 'stupid'. It does, indeed, seem more than possible that the *-tsa* is indentic with the 'Tokhari' Adjectival suffix *-ts -ats*, etc; but it may be suspected that that suffix is itself, like the *-ci* and *-ṣi* of group-flexion, derived from a substrate speech. As regards the particular instance, the reading of which is, as appears, difficult⁴⁸, it may be noted that the 'Tokhari' word itself requires explanation: the further form *agiltsa* (no. 422), which Dr. Burrow regards as a variant of *akṛatsa*, we might be tempted to interpret as its opposite, connecting it with 'Tokhari' *āklye*, 'tradition' 'learning'. A third similar epithet is the *puṅgebha* (*tsa*) of the edition⁴⁹.

Dr. Burrow's ingenious suggestion (*The Language*..., p. 119) that in no. 198 the clause printed in the edition as *ḱopi varaga syati* and translated in *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, p. 61, 'whatever be his turn', should read *ḱo pivaraga syati* and be translated 'whichever is fat' cannot be said to have been favoured by fortune. It is true that *varaga* and *pivaraga* run level in so far that both recur once only (*varaga*, no. 667, *pivarae*, no. 358), each with reference to camels. But the *vara*, i.e. presumably 'turn of usage' of a camel is so essential that in no. 73 the compound word *uṭavara* occurs (several times),

48 But *Kṛa* is the best reading; see Rapson, p. 318 of the edition.

49 These and other terms relating to camels are discussed by Professor Lüders in *BSOS*, VIII, pp. 647-651. The rare syllable read as *kṛa* recurs in the term *klasemci*, which is always used, as Dr. Burrow points out (*The Language*..., p. 85), to denote a person connected with camels. It seems possible that *kṛa* is actually the native word for 'camel,' and is related to Chinese *lo*, (Karlgren, *Analytical Dictionary*, No. 441, *lāk*) 'camel, the phonetic of which involves, according to Karlgren, an archaic *kl* or *gl*. *Klasemci* might then mean 'camel-station (*sa*)man.' On Hsi-hsia *lan-nōn* and other names for 'camel', see Laufer in *T'oung-pao*, 1916, pp. 20-2.

while in no. 72 there is a long list of oxen twice or thrice (*dvi-vara*, *tre-vara*) supplied (or despatched?) with water.

III. High official or social appellations

Under the Mahārāja, and in general residing at the centre, were various classes of persons obviously high in government or social status, *kāla*, *guśura*, *camkura*, *ogu*, *ḥitsaitsa* (°*satsa*, °*sayitsa*), *suveṭha*, *tasuca*; others are doubtful, as to whether gentile surnames or titles or occur also, or mainly, locally, e.g. *apsu*. Among these we might certainly expect to find real Lou-lan expressions; but the frequent borrowing of titles in Central Asia, as elsewhere, introduces a doubt. *Suveṭha*, *speṭha*, has a Prākṛit-like appearance and might be = Sanskrit *sviṣṭa*, *sveṣṭa* quasi 'our well-beloved', and *kāla*, 'prince', and *guśura*, may have been brought from the Indian north-western frontier. *Camkura*, 'mayor', and *ogu* clearly belong to Chinese Turkestan, the former being known also in connection with Khotan Buddhism. The import of several of the terms is discussed in *Acta Orientalia*, XIII, pp. 72-8.

Dr. Burrow's explanation (*op. cit.*, p. 82), of *ḥitsaitsa* as perhaps connected with 'Tokhari' *ḥitsaitsañe*, 'age', and meaning 'elder,' i.e. 'member of a sort of council of elders', seems commendable, and the *tsa* might be the same Adjectival suffix as in *akratsa*. But evidently this group of titles awaits explanation from the language rather than *vice versa*.

IV. Names of the country and people

The name *Shan-shan* substituted for *Lou-lan* by the Chinese in 77 B.C., was maintained by them: it is used in the *Han* (*Former* and *Later*) *Annals*, in the *Wei-luo*, and elsewhere, and locally some Chinese documents (see the edition, p. 325) mention the 'king of *Shan-shan*' and the 'command of *Shan-shan*.' But it does not follow that the name was adopted by the natives.

In the Prākṛit (nos. 678, 696, 706) *Kroraina*, °*rayina*, certainly denotes the town of the Chinese colony of Lou-lan: in no. 678 the *Kroraimci* Camaka, though residing in Calmadana (Cen-cen), is seen from the circumstances to have belonged to the same town; and similarly in no. 370 the *Kroraimci* people who have fled 'there', sc. to Cadota, from the domain of the Ogu Alpaya will have been of that town. Hence the *Kroraimci* people who occupy a district (*pradeśa*) in Cadota (no. 277) are residents from outside; and this is confirmed by the fact that the only other district cited not by the name of an individual official or owner, but of a plurality, namely

that of the *Vurcugas*, was probably likewise a settlement of outsiders. Hence any designation of 'a man of Lou-lan' or 'a man of Shan-shan' has to be discovered.

It may be noted that, though in Chinese the name of the new colony, *Lou-lan*, was identical with that of the ancient state, it does not follow that in the native language, if of a different type, the case was exactly similar. *Italica* is not identical with *Italia*, nor *Hellanium* with *Hellas*, nor *Phocaea* with *Phocis*. In *Krorayina* the *-na* or *-ina* has the appearance of a suffix, as in *Calmadana*=*Calmada*. If the original name of the country was *Krorara* or *Krorar*, it would equally have appeared in early Chinese as *Lou-lan*.

The surname *Korara*, prefixed in the Kharoṣṭhī Prākṛit to the names of *Rutraya*, *Sugita*, and *Caḡvala* (see Index), can easily be one of those place(or race)-surnames which were common in Central Asia: in the documents we have *Cadota Kuṣṣu* (no. 159), and such surnames were often used (e.g. *Cugapa*, *Parvata*) as the principal name (possibly a politeness). The Adjectival forms in *-i*, such as *Cadoti*, *Parvati*, *Khotani*, are to be suspected of being due to the Prākṛit, which did not favour the simple place-name in such usage.

Accordingly *Korara Rutraya* may be 'Rutraya of Korara', sc. of *Krorara*=*Lou-lan*. But why is a man surnamed after his country even on occasions when there is no need to distinguish him from a namesake? A simple and satisfactory answer is that he is not a native, but an outsider, in the community where he is functioning. In *Cadota*, *Rutraya* is registered as *Korara*, because he is a man of an outside region, viz. the old *Lou-lan* state. But there is another *Rutraya*, who in royal rescripts to *Cadota* is often addressed as *Kori*, with precedence over the local *cojhbo*, and who may very well be the *Vasu Kori Rutraya* of no. 393. A *Kori Viryavaṃta* has similar precedence in other documents. A *Kori Sujada* in no. 355 seems to be at court; in no. 570 *Kori Togaja*, at court, is mentioned between *Ogu's* and a *cojhbo*; concerning *Kori Spalpaya* of no. 579 nothing is to be said; but *Kori Bhimaya* in no. 704, and *Kori Muldeya* in no. 706 are addressed by the king, at *Krorayina*, in high company; the plural *Koriyana* (no. 692, at *Krorayina*) is merely on the outside of a covering-tablet. If *Korara Rutraya* is, as the occurrences suggest, merely an ordinary person from *Lou-lan*, then *Kori Rutraya* is something far more distinguished, namely a noble, representative of the *K[r]ora* race.

As has previously (*The Ganganath Jha Commemoration Volume* pp. 421-5) been pointed out, a *Kora* people is requisite for the

explanation of the name of Ptolemy's (VI, 16, §§ 2, 5, 8) '*Ottorokorrhai*' mountains, where were the source of the Bautisos, sc. the Cer-cen river, and the town '*Ottorokorrha*'. The, evidently Indian, identification with the legendary country of the Uttara-Kurus can be explained only by the preexistence of a local name resembling *Kuru*. Of course, it cannot be affirmed that this *Kora* was for *Krora*; but, if not, the Koras were certainly the near neighbours of *Krorara*.

Mention should also be made of *Lung-lo*, *Lung-le*, the original name of 'the district of Shou-ch'ang, known in Saka-Khotan as *Sucarni*, sc. the modern district of Nan-hu. This being the eastern neighbour of Lou-lan and evidently in communication therewith, its resemblance in (tribal or racial?) name may not be accidental.

V. The Language

In Indo-China the native languages came ultimately to be used in writing, so that of the Cam and Cambodian, for instance, we now possess a full knowledge and large dictionaries. In the case of the Lou-lan and Shan-shan language, or languages, this did not occur. For administrative and general use in writing the Prākṛit may have been replaced under the Tu-yu[k]-hun domination by the Chinese, which was succeeded by the Tibetan; and perhaps no sentence of the native language was ever written. The available material consists merely of individual words incorporated in the Prākṛit, with perhaps one or two in Tibetan. The paucity of such words has already become manifest: and a further scrutiny may fail to discover in the Kharoṣṭhī documents any native terms for 'god,' 'sky,' 'sun,' 'moon,' 'earth,' 'water,' 'fire,' 'wind,' 'mountain,' 'sand,' 'desert,' 'lake,' 'river'; for 'camel,' 'ass,' 'wheat,' 'barley,' 'millet,' 'gold'; for 'king,' 'queen,' 'man,' 'woman,' 'child,' 'town,' 'house,' 'husband,' 'wife,' 'law,' 'custom'; for 'body,' 'hand,' 'head,' 'foot,' etc.; or for any pronoun or numeral. In these circumstances the etymologizing of words apparently foreign to the Prākṛit and so presumably native becomes, except where the words are clearly traceable to some other known language of suitable date and proximity, an operation in *vacuo*. At one period there was a tendency, based perhaps jointly upon finds, in the Khotan region, of documents in an Iranian language and upon Mr. Joyce's anthropometrical study, to view the ancient population and speech, both of the Khotan and of the districts further east along the southern route, as of Iranian affinity. In 1925, *Asia Major*, II, pp. 251-271, and subsequently elsewhere, was adduced evidence, consisting of Proper Names, local and personal, cited in literary texts, indicating an ori-

ginal non-Iranian, apparently Tibeto-Burman, language, predecessor of the Iranian in Khotan. In 1926 a paper entitled *Names of Places and Persons in Ancient Khotan* dealt somewhat systematically with the names made available by the publication (1920) of Part I of *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestan* by A. M. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and E. Senart. The large number and variety of the names permitted a morphological study, a way of approach which is more or less practical even in the case of an etymologically unknown language. The general conclusion was that the substrate dialect was Tibeto-Burman, perhaps in some points less closely related to actual Tibetan than to others of the linguistic family. The term 'Khotan' in the title of the paper and the fact that in the contents no distinction was made between the Khotan kingdom and any other region along the southern route may perhaps be excused on the grounds (1) that, despite the clear exposition in Sir Aurel Stein's *Serindia* (pp. 219-220, 318-345), the importance of the distinction was not yet recognized, as is otherwise also manifest, (2) that all the Kharoṣṭhī documents edited in the said Part I came from a region which subsequently, at least, appertained to the Khotan kingdom, and (3) that the names explicitly connected in the documents with Khotan are not morphologically discrepant. There was however, a number of mistakes in detail, requiring to be explicitly abjured,⁵⁰ and in certain spellings the edition, using transcriptions since shown to be unreliable, was followed without question.

The strength of the prepossession in favour of Iranian, supported by the presence in the documents of a modest number of terms probably or certainly Iranian, some few perhaps definitely from Khotan, may perhaps help to account for the conviction expressed by Professor Konow (in 'Ein neuer Saka-Dialekt,' Berlin *Academy Sitzungsberichte*, 1935, pp. 772-823, see p. 792 and n. 1), who declaring himself not convinced by the etymology of the title *cojhbo* as mentioned *supra*, identifies the word confidently with an appellation *cazba*, applied to a person in several of his Marālbāshī Saka documents. In regard to this it may be remarked that (1) there is no

⁵⁰ *Silpoga* (.ka), pp. 45, 52, 58, *kilma*, p. 49, *palpi*, p. 61,—these corrected in *Acta Orientalia*, XII, p. 53, XIII, pp. 46, 62-3; *soṭhaṃgha*, p. 51—corrected, *Act. Or.*, XII, p. 45, XIII, p. 62; *ajhate*, p. 59, *tanuvaga*, pp. 49, 57, 61—Iranian and Prākṛit; *Khrom Gesar*, p. 65—see *infra*, p. 73; *Bhotinagara*, p. 49. Pirova, pp. 46-7, 57, 61—discussed elsewhere. See also remark *infra*, p. 77.

evidence that *cazba* is a title, official or otherwise, and not a prefixed surname of another kind, (2) *Marālbashī* is separated from the nearest point where *cojhbo* is attested by c. 300 miles of impassable desert in a direct line and much more by any practical route, and *cazba* is not attested anywhere between, (3) in date *cazba* is posterior to *cojhbo*, as regards attestation, by some c. 500 years (or more), (4) *cazba* has two *a*'s where *cojhbo* has two *o*'s. It is, no doubt, true that etymological connections can overleap spaces and times; but demonstration of them should not, one would think, do so, and clearly it should not neglect such difference in the vowels. If it should eventually appear that *cazba* is connected with *cojhbo*, that could only be, one would suppose, through borrowing from a common source.

In these circumstances we can appreciate the independent judgment of Professor Lüders, who from a study [*Acta Orientalia*, XVIII (1939), pp. 26-34] of the names in connection with phonological matters concludes as follows:—

'The preceding observations do not, of course, in any way claim to exhaust the question as to the language to which those foreign names belong. I was concerned only to draw attention to a point which seems to have been hitherto little or not at all regarded and which perhaps may some day contribute to a solution of the question. That the language is, as Burrow seems inclined to assume, the Tochari appears to me as little credible as its connection with the Tibetan, which Thomas conjectured. That we are concerned with an Eastern-Asian language is to me, indeed, probable, and I might hold it for not excluded that some at least of the names belong to the Chinese linguistic branch' [then follow a few particulars].

If our old and respected colleague had had his attention drawn to the article published in 1926, he would, no doubt, have admitted; what perhaps is undeniable, that the matter of the names had been treated at considerable length and somewhat systematically from the point of view which he mentions:—and he might even have allowed that some particular matters, such as final *-e* and *-i*, in their Declensional relation to *-aya*, *-eya* and *-iya*, the frequency of names in *-ge*, etc., had received attention, and further, that the system of the nomenclature had been contemplated. It cannot be said that Professor Lüders' view is in general concurrence with that put forward in the article, and some scrutiny of it may be permissible. But first a word may be interpolated concerning the theory of Dr. Burrow, to which he refers.

From what has been cited *supra* it is indubitable that the Lou-lan people had contacts on the north with the Chü-shih (Guchen-Turfan) kingdom, where the language was rather certainly 'Tokhari'. On the north-west also, if the little states of Mo-shan, Wei-hsü and Wei-li (the two last, at any rate, usually connected with Karashahr) were also of 'Tokhari' speech, there was some slender chain of 'Tokhari' linking Lou-lan to the known 'Tokhari' areas of Karashahr and Kuca. Thus Lou-lan might be supposed a further link in the chain, and the words *akratsa* and *kitsaitsa* mentioned *supra* might be regarded as linguistic evidence of connection. Dr. Burrow⁵¹, however, admitting the paucity of such lexical evidences, seems to lay most stress upon phonological similarity, such as lack (not affirmed as absolute) of voiced consonants, aspirates, and spirantic $\chi \theta f$, and of *v*, palatalization of *l*, *n*, and perhaps *t*, before *i*, also elisions of vowels: he adduces, further, the use of certain suffixes. Dr. Burrow's rapidly stated evidences could not be examined except at considerable length and with close regard to their correctness, completeness and validity. The absence of mediae in the Shan-shan language seems highly questionable: lack of spirants $\chi \theta f$, of *v* and *h*, together with regular insertion of *y* between certain consonants and *-i* or *-e*, appears in a Tibeto-Burman language not remote from Lou-lan and partly in Tibetan itself. The matter of the suffixes will in part be considered *infra*. Here, as the theory is still rather vague, it may be relevant to make three general observations: (1) The 'Tokhari' language is not known to us, except for a few names of perhaps that origin in impossible Chinese transcriptions, until a period posterior by c. 400 agitated years to the Kharoṣṭhī documents. (2) the language was in all probability intrusive at some period in Chinese Turkestan and is likely to owe some of its remarkable phonetic and other peculiarities to a native substrate, and (3) if its highly complex structure existed contemporaneously with the Kharoṣṭhī, the latter should have shown some definite traces of it. Unfortunately we have not for any period any appreciable quantity of 'Tokhari' personal names.

Returning to Professor Lüders' exposition, we cannot contest the supposition that some of the personal names in the documents may be Chinese. But there are limits to this: it should be remembered that from Krorayina have come more than 1000 Chinese documents contemporary with the Kharoṣṭhī, and that these contain

51 See *JRAS*, 1935, pp. 667-675, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents...*, (1937), pp. viii-ix.

numerous Chinese personal names, the forms of which seem to have been perfectly intelligible, for the most part, to the accomplished editors.⁵² The identification of Chinese names in the Kharoṣṭhi would therefore be to Sinologist scholars not so difficult that a considerable quantity of them could escape detection. This therefore could be put to an early test: non-Sinologists can somewhat help themselves reflecting that no such names can contain a 'suffix'. The phonology does not seem promising.

As a curiosity, it may be noted that *per contra* one or two Shan-shan native names occur in the Chinese. Thus there is a 'Kun Nasien of the Lou-lan state,' who in Kharoṣṭhi would perhaps have been *Kunasena* (a frequently recurring name), and an often mentioned *Ma-li*, clearly identical with a likewise often mentioned *cu-pu* Ma, who may be a namesake of the *Mahārāja* Mahiri and perhaps also of a Kharoṣṭhi *Mariśrr[ga]*.⁵³

Professor Lüders, in holding (p. 32) that the majority of the names were really dissyllabic and that in origin they were neither Indian nor Iranian, may be considered, more especially in view of his reference to Chinese, to approximate to the view that the language was of the monosyllabic kind. But this is not explicitly stated, and in fact Professor Lüders speaks not of Chinese, but of the Chinese linguistic branch.

52 See the above-noted publications of Chavannes and Conrady.

53 See Conrady, *op. cit.*, p. 98 (*Kunasena*), p. 191 (*Mariśrr*). *Ma Li* is mentioned on pp. 83, 88, 94 ('of Lou-lan'), 97, 140; and *cu-pu* Ma, pp. 91, 98, 140, is regularly identified by Conrady as 'Ma (Li)', which seems correct, because in Chavannes nos. 746 and 747 a '*cu-pu* Ma-Li' is named, in no. 747 entitled also 'charged with the administration of the pass'; in Conrady, p. 135, is mentioned a *ts'ung-yüan-wei*, *Ma Li*, possibly again the same person.

The expression *cu-pu* (*tśiu-b'uo*, Karlgren, nos. 1244, 764) is in the documents regularly translated ('le comptable' = 'responsible' or 'accountant') by Chavannes, but not elsewhere, in its slightly modified occurrence as an official title, 152 A.D., in the state of (Kh)yü-mi, the eastern neighbour of Khotan: here he writes (*T'oung-pao*, II. viii, p. 173) *tchou-pouo*, the character being Karlgren, nos. 1244 and 764 (*tśiu-b'ák*). Conrady never translates. The difference between the Chinese character for *b'uo* and *b'ák* being minute, it seems likely that in both cases the same native title is transcribed, a fact of some significance in view of the situation of the two places, Krorayina and (Kh) yü-mi, adjoining the eastern and western extremities of the Shan-shan state.

At this point some facts may perhaps be usefully adduced. In the *J.R.A.S.* 1928, pp. 91-96, has been published a considerable collection of personal names of c. VIIth-VIIIth centuries A.D. belonging to the Tun-huang region. Passing over those which are Tibetan, we find that (1) the personal names are nearly all dissyllabic and (2) they are mostly preceded by a surname, usually a gentile or clan name, which gives us two types—

(1) for a man: *Bam Kun-tse, Kuag Tam-tam*

(2) for a woman: *Soñ Sam-ñañ, Kuag-za Ji-lim*

The *za* following *Kuag* in (2) is certainly a Tibetan addition, since it was almost universal in formal names of Tibetan wives and other ladies: it is simply = *bza*, 'woman,' 'wife.' *Samñañ* is certainly Chinese: it means 'Third-woman (sc. daughter?),' this numerical type having many examples; and *Soñ* is the family or clan name. The reduplication form, *Tam-tam*, is common perhaps not under all gentile heads. Most numerous and widely represented is the type *Kun-tse*, with *tse* as second member, more especially if we include those with *tshe*. Since *tse/tshe* does not appear in names of women, it may mean 'son'; but then, unless we are assured that the name is Chinese, in which case the *-tse* is probably = Chinese *tzū*, 'son', a doubt may arise, since both 'Tokhari' and Saka-Khotanī can furnish a *se, sa*, meaning 'son' and therewith a possible origin of the Kharoṣṭhī Prākṛit *-se, -seva* and *-sena*. Of the dissyllabic names such as *Ji-lim*, which have not a stereotyped second syllable, many could, no doubt, be detected by scholars as Chinese; and in some cases of flowery names of women, e.g. *Hva-sim*, 'Flower-mind', this may be conjectured even by an outsider. But it is likely that a proportion of the names may have belonged to 'natives' of various local races.

The old Tibetan names of pre-Buddhist type; whereof we have perhaps some thousand, are likewise mainly dissyllabic, such as *Klu-legs*, 'Dragon-good', *Dpal-bzañ*, 'Majesty-great' (or 'kind'), *Rgyal-gzigs*, 'Victory-look', *Myes-tshab*, 'Grandfather-substitute', *Stag-skyes*, 'Tiger-born' (or 'male'). The meaning is usually clear; but in some cases one or other of the components is of unascertained meaning, or there are mixtures comparable to Sanskrit *Aśvagupta*, Greek *Pheidippides*. The (prefixed) surnames may be gentile or tribal, as in the case of *Sroñ-btsan* Sgam-po's famous minister Mgar (or *Hgar*) 'stoñ-rtsan, or merely local, as in *Tshe-spoñ Tre-goñ*, or very widely territorial or national, e.g. *Rma-*, '(of) the Hoang-ho (river country),' *Khrom Ge-sar*, 'Ge-sar of Khrom', *Li-*, 'Khotani'.

When there is an official or similar title, e.g. *Blon*, 'Councillor', *Jo-co*, 'Chief', the surname is usually omitted.

In view of these usages, showing no trace of 'suffixes', the question of suffixes in the Shan-shan names becomes crucial. The difficulty is due in part to different ways of approach on the part of scholars, according as one regards the matter from the Indianist side, another from some other linguistic quarter. But the difference does not begin at once. Thus Professor Lüders considers (p. 33) that many final *a*'s after consonants in Shan-shan names are Indianizing additions; and here there will be general agreement, in principle, on the part of those who remember the Indian practice at all periods. *suruṅga* (Gk. *sūriṅg-*), *Cīna* (*Tsin*), *tikīna* (*Turk tegin*), *Toramāna* (*Türmān*), *Mahāmada* (*Muhammad*), *Akabbara* (*Akbar*), *Mokṣamūlara* (*Max Müller*). But, when we come to cases with vowels, e.g. *-eya*, *iya*, *-ua*, on the Indian side, e.g. *Yaua(sa)* (*yabgu*), *Mahiphatiena* (*Instrumental of Mahipati*), the Prākṛit view begins to posit a lost consonant and we may notice the actual occurrence of *yavuga*, which however, is ambiguous. Then, in the Kharoṣṭhī there are numerous words, whereof Professor Lüders has given long lists, in which *-aya* has become *-e* and *-iya* and *-ikā* *-i*; and this leads to the supposition that the longer forms, where found, are mere writings, the shorter forms being those actually spoken. In some particular instances an objection may be raised: thus *striya* does not seem to be, as suggested on p. 28, a mere writing of *stri*; its Genitive *striyae* shows that it is an *-ā* stem, parallel to *niśā*, *vācā*, *diśā*, *śrīyā*, *māārā*, *gauā*, and other feminines of the Prakrit period.⁵⁴ That the forms in *-eya*, *-iya*, are merely writings is evident in various ways, from alternation and from Genitives such as *Sugeṣa*, *palpisa*; but Genitives and Instrumentals such as *Vuruṣa* (never *Vuruṣa*) from *Vuru*, *palpiyena* (never *palpina*) from *palpi*, seem to show that after *u* and *i* the *a*-declension was convenient in those cases, as in the above-noted *yauasa* and *Mahiphatiena*.

In the 1926 article also the *-e*, *-i*, *-o*, *-u*, were taken as the real terminations in the native names and *-a* also was widely admitted; it was assumed that their existence, if proved, was self-justificatory. But in nearly all cases they were regarded not as being in them-

⁵⁴ See Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, § 413, and note that the Bhandarkar-Fleet explanation (*JRAS.* 1908, pp. 476-7) of *bhīcā* in the expression *silāvigaḍabhīcā*, occurring in the Rummāndei inscription, as connected with Sanskrit *bhitti*, 'wall,' may after all be correct, if we derive *bhīcā*, not from *bhittikā*, but from *bhittiyā*.

selves 'suffixes', but as belonging to suffixal syllables, e.g. *-ta*, *-te*, *-to*, with a preceding consonant. The existence of some such 'suffixes' may be taken as generally admitted, e.g. the *-(m)ca*, expressing plurality and the *-imci*, signifying connection with a place: the latter is perhaps so ancient that it may possibly be recognized in the name of the *Yüeh-chih*, i.e. the *Nwet* (Tangut) people.⁵⁵ Whether Professor Lüders would admit the existence of further 'suffixes' is perhaps not clear, his exposition being presented as selective, not as exhaustive; thus, in affirming the priority of *Cgito* to *Cigito* and *Lpipta* to *Lpipita* (p. 33) he does not raise the question whether the *-to* and *-ta* are, or are not 'suffixes'. That in any case they are separate elements is proved by the existence of evidently related names. *Cigana* and *Cgoya* in the one case, *Lpipaae*, *Lpipamga*, *Lpipana*, *Lpipama*, *Lpipa*, *Lpipga*. etc., in the other.

In regard, however, to such alternatives as *Sugi/Sugita*, *Kupşu/Kupşuta*, which sometimes, no doubt, as Professor Lüders

55 That *Tangut* was properly a place-name (like *Thogara*) appears from the well-known reference (see Thomsen, *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon*, pp. 123, 178 (89) by the Northern Turk *khaqan* Bilgä to his invasion of it (*Taiut*) during his 27th year (709-710 A.D.). The word cannot here refer to the Tibetans: during the period in question the Tibetans were in general accord with the Turks, and they were not in occupation of any part of Kan-su, their first attack upon Kwa-chou taking place in 727 A.D., when they hoped for Turk co-operation: moreover, the name of Tibet in the same inscription is *Tüpüt* (see Index). It is credible that the Turks, who in the same passage mention the Sogdians under an ancient form (*Sogdak*) of their name, should have preserved the old Chinese form of the name *Ta-yüeh* (*-ci*), as known to the Hsiung-nu. The *Yüeh* (*Nwet*)-*ci* will have been the people of the *Yüeh* (*Nwet*) country (or region), which does not, however, preclude the possibility that the region derived its name from the, or a, tribe, the two notions being inseparable. The name *Yüeh* (*Nwet*)-*ci* may have been one not recognized by the people themselves, but given by their neighbours. A, perhaps not fatal, objection to the above conjecture must be seen in the fact that the *Yüeh*-*ci*, while still in Kan-su, do not appear to have been known to the Hsiung-nu as *Ta-yüehci*: see the communications to the Chinese translated in De Groot, *Die Hunnen der vorchristlichen Zeit*, p. 76 (176 B.C.), and *Die Westland Chinas...*, p. 9 (c. 140 B.C.). Was that form used even by the Chinese prior to the foundation of the *Yüeh-chih* kingdom in Baktria?

points out, designate an identical person⁵⁶ it is clearly stated that the shorter forms are derived from the longer, *Sugit*, *Kupṣut* (the *-a* being understood as a Prākṛit addition), by disappearance of *-t*, which had been affirmed in some instances of Indian names, e.g. *Jiva-rakṣi*. But there does not seem to be ground for positing any loss of final consonants in the native language; and the history of personal names elsewhere does not confirm an explanation of the (supposed) shortening as of a phonetic character: it is not through a phonetic process that in English *William* and *James* become *Will*, *Willy*, *Willie*, *Jamie*. Also, as regards the supposed forms *Sugit*, *Kupṣut* without *-a*, it seems unfortunate that they should have no connection with such as *Lpīpta*, where Professor Lüders does not discard the *-a*, and rather numerous others, e.g. *Kupṣimta*, *Kusaṃta*, *Lpimirta*, *Tsagirsta*, which seem to merit a like treatment.

Another matter which is explicit in Professor Lüders' exposition (p. 34) is insertion of inorganic vowels: thus not only is *Cigito* derived from *Cgito*, and not *vice versa*, as one would have been inclined to suppose,⁵⁷ but *Mañigeya*, *Kolpige*, (despite *Kolpiṣa*), *Kalpige* (despite *Kalpiṣa*), *Malpige*, *Paluge* (despite *Palvisae*, *Paluvisae*), *Camasu* (despite *Camaga*, *Camaḡa*, *Camaśriae*, *Camimta*, *Camo*, etc.), are substitutes in writing for *Mañ-ge'*, *Kol-ge'*, *Kal-ge'*, *Mal-ge*, *Pal-ge'*, *Cam-su* respectively. In all these cases the real spoken form was dissyllabic.

In the 1926 article *-ta*, *-to*, *-ge*, and many other terminal syllables were regarded as 'suffixes'; and considerable lists of examples, which now, in consequence of the publication of Parts II and III of the edition, could be amplified,⁵⁸ were given under each head. The examples were roughly divided into 'Primary' and 'Secondary,' the latter being for the most part names of three or more syllables, frequently with the second syllable also recognizable as a 'suffix'; but

56 It cannot, however, be assumed in general that in cases such as *Ari Sugi* and *Ari Sugita* the identical surname suffices to prove identity of persons. Frequently a gentile surname restricts, or even dictates, the choice of personal names, and it is perhaps specially productive of similarities of name, such as between *Sugi* and *Sugita*, in the group.

57 The loss of vowels, as posited in the 1926 article (p. 55), might have been expected to commend itself to those who, with Professor Lüders (p. 27), regard *Butsena*, *Butsenga*, for instance, as really derived from *Budhaṣena* and *Budhaṣenika*, and not as Hobson-Jobsonisms.

58 Unfortunately the lists contain a considerable number of errors and could not be used without circumspection.

some instances where an original second syllable had lost its vowel, e.g. *Kamcge* from *Kamcage*, were reckoned as 'Secondary.' Of -ge 'Primary' over 20 examples were given, of -ge 'Secondary' about 15. By this procedure the root forms of the language are reduced to monosyllables, and it was concluded that the language was of the monosyllabic type. The conclusion is, indeed, not inevitable: in the English word 'denationalization' the removal of formatives leaves as the root basis only the syllable *na*, and even in that the -a may have been a 'determinative' (*gen-ā*); yet the early Indo-European was not monosyllabic. The clearness, however, with which the structure can be seen in the Shan-shan names seems to indicate a stage still monosyllabic or an early period of transition. The accumulation of formatives exemplified, e.g. by *Yipicga*, if = *Yi-pi-ca-ga*, and the exiguity of the 'root', *yi*, are no objection: such accumulation was regarded by B. H. Hodgson (*JASB.* XXII, 1850, pp. 132-5) as an essential characteristic of the large groups of Asiatic languages; cf. what is stated in the *Linguistic Survey of India*, I. i., pp. 36-7, concerning Muṇḍā languages. The slightness of the root, *yi* (or *i*), is, of course, paralleled by many Chinese words of substantial meaning and by not a few in Tibeto-Burman: in Tibetan, for instance, *yig*, 'writing,' 'letter,' was originally *yi-ge*, a form well known in texts.

A marked peculiarity of the Shan-shan suffixes is the vowel ablaut seen in -ta, -te, -to. From the lists some few examples may be quoted—

	a	e	o
'Primary':	<i>Apta</i> , <i>Yita</i> (gá, etc.)	<i>Aṃte</i> , <i>Pite</i> (ya):	<i>Aṃto</i> , <i>Pito</i> (e)
	<i>Spirta</i> ;		
'Secondary':	<i>Śirjhata</i> (from <i>Śirsa</i>);	<i>Śirsate</i> (yae);	<i>Cokaṃto</i> (ae) (<i>Coḱa</i>
	<i>Lpimirta</i>	<i>Vugite</i> (cf.	<i>Vugato</i> (cf.
	(from <i>Lpimira</i>);	<i>Vugica</i>);	<i>Vugaca</i> , etc.)
	<i>Taṃcgota</i>	<i>Bhurim̐te</i> (ya);	<i>Tsugam̐to</i> (cf.
	(from <i>Taṃcgo</i>);		<i>Tsugeta</i> , etc.)

If this vowel-variation were confined to the *t*- 'suffixes', it might conceivably be regarded as accidental. But it recurs in other cases: we find—

<i>ka/ke/ko</i> :	<i>Car̐ka</i> ; <i>Tsur̐ke</i> (ya); <i>Car̐ko</i> , etc.
	<i>Sugika</i> . <i>Ciyoka</i> , <i>Lpimir̐ka</i> ; <i>Sugiko</i> , <i>Śaṃg̐ko</i> (ya), etc.
<i>ga/ge/go</i> :	<i>Suga</i> (e), <i>Yapga</i> <i>Laṃga</i> ; <i>Apge</i> , <i>Yipge</i> , <i>Sugo</i> (e);
	<i>Yipgo</i> , <i>Laṃgo</i> , etc.
	<i>Taṃcga</i> , <i>Bhugelaga</i> ; <i>Taṃcge</i> , <i>Caṃmage</i> , <i>Paṃsuge</i> ;
	<i>Taṃcgo</i> , <i>Bhugelugo</i> , etc.

<i>ca/ce/co</i> :	<i>Pgeca, Piteca, Vugaca, Kapoca; Argice(ya);</i> <i>Pgoco, etc.</i>
<i>na/ne/no</i> :	<i>Pulna, Cipna; Soṃne, etc.</i> <i>Pgena, Kacana, Lpimirna; Kacano, etc.</i>
<i>ma/me/mo</i> :	<i>Cama(śrṛ, etc.), Cima(ga); Kulme; Camo, Kulmo, etc.</i> <i>Cinama, Sugama; Sagamo, etc.</i>
<i>ra/re/ro</i> :	<i>Catara(ṛa); Catre, Rutre; Catro, Rutro, etc.</i> <i>Lpimira, Panagara; Caṛare, etc.</i>
<i>la/le/lo</i> :	<i>Yila(ga); Yile, Kole(ca); Kolo(e), etc.</i> <i>Aṃṇila, Cimala, Bhugela(ga); Mogale(ya), Baṛule;</i> <i>Jivalo, Aṃṇilo, etc.</i>
<i>sa/se/so</i> :	<i>Śirsa, Preṣā(ṃdha); Prese, etc.</i> <i>Calmasa, Catisa, Kugeṣa, Priyosa, etc.</i>

It will perhaps be granted that in the 'Secondary' use the 'suffixes,' with their initial consonant, were in real, and indeed active, currency. In many 'primary' forms also, such as *Kapga, Tsurṛe, Cipna, Kulme, Catma, Catro, Śirsa*, where the preceding syllable ends in a consonant, a like assent may be anticipated. But in forms such as *Moga/Moge, Pite/Pito, Koṇe, Kame, Camo, Kale, Puse*, it may seem not at all clear that the consonant does not belong to the 'root' syllable, in which case it would be necessary to admit 'suffixes' consisting of a vowel: and it may be further remarked that *-i* and *-u* forms of the 'suffixes', noted in the lists, e.g. *Kaṛi (Kaṛe), Aṃgi (Aṃgo), Aptagi, Cimi(da), Aṃti, Kori, Yili, Ralsi(ta), Parku(ta), Tagu, Pacgu, Lustu, Kapu(ṃca), Camsu, Lpimsu*, have been passed over.⁵⁹ Provisionally, however, this question is not particularly urgent: so long as a 'suffix'-variation *ma/me/mo* is a certainty, it is not necessary, until we are considering the origin of the vowel-variation in the 'suffix', to decide whether the same variation occurs in other situations also, *Cama, Came, Camo*, being from *Cam-a, Cam-e, Cam-o*. But it may be noted that in the current usage the vowel-variation must, by reason of its frequency, have been felt to have some significance: thus, since the Central-Asian languages were

59 The *-i* forms are inconvenient because of the possibility that some of them are Prākṛitic; the *-u* forms are comparatively few. On the Tibeto-Burman side also there are uncertainties: it is not certain that the Locative suffixes *-ru* and *-su* in Tibetan are connected with *ra* and *sa* or that the *-gu* suffix is connected with *-ga*.

prone to use 'honorifics'. *Cigito* may have been a more respectful form than *Cigita*.

The significant matter here is that the same vowel-variation, largely with the same suffixes, is found in Tibetan and other Tibeto-Burman dialects of north-eastern 'Tibet'. In the conjugation of verb-roots ending in a consonant this ancient ablaut is exhibited in all manuals of Tibetan, e.g. *byed*, 'do', *byas*, 'done', *byos*, 'do', *hdren*, *trañ*, *droñs*, 'lead': but it often also occurs otherwise, giving alternative verb-roots shown in the lexicons, as *sñeg/sñog*, 'follow', *gcad/bcad/gcod*, 'cut', 'decide', *hgal*, 'disagree', 'err', *hgoł*, 'separate', 'stray', *gtod/gtad*, 'hand over', *sog/gsag*, 'collect', *sems/bsam*, 'think', (*som-ñi*, 'doubt'),⁶⁰ *sel/gsał*, 'make' or 'be clear'. The *a/o* ablaut is frequent in connection with verb-roots ending in the vowel *a*, not only in Imperatives, such as *ltos*, 'see', from *lta*, *zos*, 'eat', from *za*, but also in independent words, *ltos*, 'look', *zlo/bzla*, 'call', *zlos*, 'charm', 'spell', *chos*, 'religion', from *hchañ*, 'prepare', 'institute'. This *a/o* alternation is seen markedly in the two words *ra*, 'enclosed space', *sa*, 'land', 'spot', on their way to becoming 'suffixes': thus the *ra* of *ldum-ra*, 'garden', *btson-ra*, 'prison', becomes *ro* when denoting a large area, as in *Cog-ro*, 'the Cog country', *Myañ-ro*, 'the Myañ-country'; and *sa*, 'place', is so in *so-mishams*, 'land-boundary', *ñan-so*, 'inferior position', *khab-so*, 'mansion', *gtad-so*, 'a refuge'. The very ancient suffix *ma*, found perhaps also in Burmese, competes with *mo* over a wide field of denotations in Adjectives, names of actions, agents, parts of the body, instruments, plants, nature-features (*ñi-ma*, 'sun', *skar-ma*, 'star', *ñin-mo*, 'day', etc., etc.). The pluralizing suffix *-cag* (probably from *-ca-ge*) in pronouns and elsewhere alternates with *-cog*.

There is a fair number of old Tibetan words in *-ga* (*cho-ga*, 'method,' etc.) and *-ka*, some in *-ge* (*yi-ge*, 'writing,' *señ-ge*, 'lion,' etc.); and the antiquity of *-ga/-ka* is shown by the fact that in VIIIth-IXth century MSS. connected with the Koko-nor region it is normal in relation to places, e.g. in *sa-ga*, 'belonging to earth,' *gnam-ka*, 'belonging to heaven,' *Tsoñ-ka*, later the birth-place of the famous Tsoñ-kha-pa, which suggests that some of the later words with *-kha*, like *sñiñ-kha* (and *ga*) once had the same. But the most interesting of such early 'suffixes,' of which there are in normal Tibetan a few examples, e.g. *rgyal-ta*, 'a fire,' *kħwa-ta*, 'crow,' *ñal-ta*, 'service,' is that with *t*, whence we have the three forms *ta/te/to*. *Ta* occurs

in a few names of the period indicated, *Btshan-ta*, *Legs-koñ-ta*, *Legs-kri-ta*, where it is evidently equivalent to the *to* in certain contemporary names, *Btsan-to-re*, 'Puissant-is,' *Sgra-yas-to*, 'sound (voice? fame?)-unlimited.' But a much wider prospect is opened when we turn to an ancient Tibeto-Burman language of the Koko-nor region. Here the Tibetan noun-verb suffix *pa/ba* is wanting, and its place is taken by *-ta*, as in *chos-ta*, 'a beginning,' *bśi-ta*, 'a dead man,' *ḥśes-ta*, 'the knowing'; and we have such forms as *ño-sto* (= *ños-to*), 'friend,' and *to* commonly occurs as a verb-suffix at the end of a sentence, as in *stor-to*, 'were scattered.' The last-cited usage is evidently identical with the well-known Tibetan Preterite ending *to*, e.g. in *bstan-to*, 'showed'; and this enables us to see that the not less frequent *te*, e.g. in *ḥphom-te-drañ* 'are led conquered,' is identical with the common Tibetan Gerund-suffix *-te* (*de*, *ste*). Nor can the inherent meaning of the 'suffix' be hidden from us. *Ta* is simply the verb 'be'; and as an auxiliary it is still used in eastern and north-eastern 'Tibet,'⁶¹ where we have such forms of the Present Tense as *rig-ta*, '(I) see (it),' *rig-me-ta*, 'do not see it,' Rockhill, *Diary of a Journey*, p. 270. The *te*, *de*, of the Tibetan Gerund clearly is a form of the same verb, with the signification 'being'; and in the language above mentioned it is similarly used and also as a merely Adjective-forming suffix: the *to-* form is perhaps merely a more emphatic *ta*. *Btshan-ta* may thus be in relation to *Btshan-to* (*-re*, another 'is'-word, very common (*red*) in ordinary southern Tibetan) precisely what in Shan-shan *Cigita* was to *Cigito*.

As was noted in the 1926 article (p. 55, cf. p. 76) the vocalic variation must have had an origin or origins: but we can hardly expect to explain it or them, since the alternation seems to belong to the arcana of the Tibeto-Burma dialects of 'Tibet,' at any rate. Nor could we expect it to be manifested equally in all the different suffixes: we can only endeavour to define the actual usages where we find them, and even that can be done only vaguely. The *a/o* alternation we have found in normal Tibetan current—

- (1) in the very ancient *m*-suffix,
- (2) in the plural suffix *ca* (*g*), *co* (*g*),
- (3) in certain *-a* verb-roots, such as *za/zo*, 'eat,'

61 The same verb, *ta*, *to*, with the meaning 'be,' 'become,' is used also in several Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan group; see *Linguistic Survey of India*, III.i, pp. 185, 192, 435, 445, 456, 463.

- (4) in certain nouns, e.g. *ra/ro*, 'bounded space,' *sa/so*, 'earth,' 'place,' 'station or grade.'

Here we do not seem able to adduce relevant forms with -e (*re(s)*, 'a turn,' and *re(d)*, 'be,' may not be connected with *ra*); but the *ga/ka* suffix has a few Tibetan parallels in -ge, and, since, as forming Adjectives, it is probably of pronominal origin, the *go/ko* of *ḥdi-ko*, 'this same,' *de-ko*, 'that very,' will be akin, more especially in view of *de-ka*, 'that very,' *gñis-ka*, *gñi-ga*, 'the two,' etc.—in the above-mentioned language of the north-east *ge* is a particle of enormous frequency, sometimes found conjoined with the *ta-* suffix in a way exemplified in the following passage—

ḥde-me-ḥtaḥ-g-roṇ-ḥyed-ge-ta-ḥwa-ste-ḥtaḥ.

'the fires of prosperity, with cooling or dying emissions, are done for' (conjectural translation).

Here the first *ḥtaḥ* is appended to the compound *ḥde-me*, 'prosperity-fire'; the second is attached to the attribute *g-roṇ-ḥyed* with an intervening *ge*; the third acts as the verb 'are,' ending the sentence. In *ḥwa-ste* (i.e. *ḥwas-te*) we have an equivalent of the Tibetan Gerund *bas-te*, 'being done for.' The accumulation of forms of the *ta-* suffix has evidently a rhetorical effect. The combination -*ge-ta* is reminiscent of the Shan-shan name *Lalugeta*, in which both the -*ge* and the -*ta* are indubitably 'suffixes.'

This remarkable vowel-ablaut, common to the Shan-shan language and dialects of north-eastern Tibet and to a considerable extent found in connection with identical 'suffixes', seems to demonstrate some close morphological affinity. It suggests a search for lexical correspondences. Unfortunately the Proper Names, which constitute the bulk of the material, are the most unpromising field for any serious inquiry of that kind; and the other available expressions fail, as has been noted, to include any of the important objects of nature or notions of common life, all these being mentioned by Prākṛit terms. But certainly we have a few place-names ending in a -*sa*, which might be equivalent to Tibeto-Burman *sa*, 'earth', 'ground', 'place', 'residence', (e.g. in *Lha-sa*): *Samarsa* is definitely a place, and so, apparently, is *Bhagasa* in no. 608, as is also indicated by the derivatives *Bhagaṣaci* and *Bhagaseñci*: the four forms *Koltarsa* and °*ṣa* (always a surname), *Cadiyaarsa*, *Manasarsa*, *Mantarsa*, should be analogous to *Samarsa*. Upon this basis it was suggested in the 1926 article (pp. 67-8) that a number of other forms in -*sa* (e.g. *Calmasa*, *Catisa*, *Huvisa*, *Palvisa* etc.), were really

residence-names applied to persons, a procedure familiar both in the east and in the west. In connection with the expression *Catisa deviyae* (nos. 46, 334) it has been suggested by Dr. Burrow (*JRAS.*, 1935, p. 672) that *-sa* tends to be a feminine suffix. He admits, however, that it is found in names of men; and in fact it is never found in women's names. This appears, in fact, in the very example *Catisa deviyae*, Genitive of *Catisa-deviya*; for the femininity is expressed by the word *deviya*, and this is seen in no. 295, *devi Catisae* (for *Catisae*) where the order of the two terms is reversed, and the real feminine suffix, *-e*, appears: *Cadiṣae* occurs in no. 606. The constant, almost invariable, spelling of *-isa*, *-isae*, names with *s*, not *ś*, seems to indicate that the *sa* was something more than a suffix.

That *-e* was the regular feminine termination⁶² and was appended to corresponding masculine names was shown in the 1926 article (pp. 52-3), where a good number of examples was cited, e.g. *Apisae* from *Apisa*, *Namilgae* from *Namilga*, *Sarvinae* from *Sarvina*, *Camotie* from *Camoti*, *Catoe* from *Cato*, *Sarvaśrīe* from *Sarvaśrī*. In no. 110 there is a list of 10 women, all with names ending in *-e*; and similarly in no. 552 a list of 8 women, apparently wives of the persons (none of the latter with such an *-e*) named along with them severally. The Genitive of this *-e* was *-ae*, as if from an *-ā* stem, and this Case-relation is clearly shown, for instance, in no. 719 where *Camṭamnoe* is the Nominative and the Genitive *Camṭamnoae* appears, as frequently, in connection with *naṃmā* (English 'name of'): similarly in no. 53 *Camo(e)* appears in the superscription,⁶³ but *Camoae nama* in the text. Where the Nominative ends in *-ae*, the Genitive should be in *-aae*, as *Namilgaae* (no. 288); but the awkwardness of the combination of vowels and the irregularities of the syntax have led to some confusions. In no. 399 two Nominatives in *-ae*, *Cataroyae* and *Pacguyae*, have Genitives in *-ṣa*.

In Tibeto-Burman languages it may not be possible to find an equivalent to this feminine *-e* 'suffix'. To judge from the above-

62 It is not contended that there were no feminine names without *-e*: Prākṛit forms in *-ā* might of course, be expected. As regards *Tilutamae/°uae* in no. 566 it seems that the *-e* was present in the Nominative; but *Konuma*, Genitive *Konumae*, is clear in no. 46, and *Sugnumae* is in no. 481 (thrice) a Genitive.

63 In the expression *Lpipe Camo Palvisae ca* the *-e* of *Palvisae* may have served also for *Camo(e)*.

described use of Tibetan (*b*)*za* and Chinese *niang* in feminine nomenclature, it should be an independent word, meaning 'woman' or 'daughter': there is, however, no basis for adducing Hsi-hsia *yi*, *i*, 'woman' (see Laufer in *T'oung-pao*, II. xvii (1916), pp. 64-5) or Burushaski *-i*, 'daughter' (Col. Lorimer's *The Burushaski Language*, III, p. 12). In the Shan-shan *-e* names it does not appear that the prior part was the name of the father: certainly it was not that of the mother. *A priori*, a 'family' or 'residence' name would seem likely. There does not seem to be any instance of *-e* appended to a female animal's name.

If there was, as has been here expounded, a living Tibeto-Burman factor in the Shan-shan language, it yet does not follow that the language was wholly of that character. Two features in the phonology of the names seem adverse to that supposition. The first of the two is the absence of the consonantal Prefixes of the Tibetan, some of which certainly existed, though much less developed, in the north-eastern (Ch'iang) dialects of the country: the therewith connected initial aspirates, *kh*, *ch*, *th*, *ph*, seem likewise little apparent. Secondly, the relative frequency of initial vowels and final breathed consonants in the names, and also elsewhere, e.g. in *Ap(ge)*, *Op(ge)*, *Ap(ta)*, *Cat(ma)*, *yat(ma)*, *ageta*, *Carto*, is *prima facie* adverse. Some historical considerations also perhaps interpose. The Chinese evidently distinguished the Lou-lan people from the Ch'iang despite the intercourse between the two: also the settled civilization, such as it was, of the western parts (Caḍota, etc.) of Shan-shan, if it was, as Grenard surmised, concerning Chinese Turkestan in general, of great antiquity, may have long preceded the special Ch'iang developments of Tibeto-Burman, which in Chinese records do not appear very early. Hence the Shan-shan language may have had a prior, non(or hardly)-Tibeto-Burman character. If with this in view, we should contemplate Professor Lüders' expression 'language of eastern Asia,' it would not be one of the great known languages or groups, Chinese, Turkish, Hun, Mongol, etc., that would come into consideration. These appeared too late in the vicinity of Chinese Turkestan. It would be little peoples of pre-Chinese Kan-su and and Shen-si, subsequently extinguished or Sinified, such as the 'northern Man' and the 'I,' still recognized by the Chinese of the 1st century A.D., and even later, as really existent and settled under Chinese control. This may be found, as some relatively recent observations

suggest* not to be in disaccord with what was suggested in 1921 (*JRAS.*, p. 279) and repeated in 1925 and 1926 as to possible connections with pre-Tibetan (sc. Mon/Man) speech in Western 'Tibet'.

On the basis of the name-forms it does not seem at present possible to distinguish between the Lou-lan population and that of the more westerly (Caḍota) region of Shan-shan. Even the names explicitly from the Khotan kingdom, still further west, viz. *Apge*, *Kanasaga*, *Moṣana*, *Preṣāmdha*, *Śakhaa*, to which might be added the probably place-surname *Kilpagi*, show no difference of type. But the question of the population of Khotan itself is in some points special and requires a separate consideration.*

* We regret that owing to the want of types with proper diacritical marks we have been constrained to use in the above article: d (or ḍ) for ḍ'; g for g', ḡ; h for h'; j for j'; p for p'; t for t'; v for v'; and y for y'; in roman where the original word containing the letter is printed in italics, and *vice versa*.—Editor.

Waručān=Šāh

By Dr. W. B. Henning

The Manichaeans in Iran possessed a *Missionary History* of which we have fragments in three languages, in Middle Persian, Parthian, and Sogdian. A page of the Middle Persian version was published in 1933¹; it deals with the missions to the West (under Patecius and Addai) and to Khorasan, under Mār Ammō. More extensive is the Sogdian version, but nothing has been published so far; it is concerned mainly with the various missions to western countries (Patecius, Addai, Gabriah), but contains also the beginning of the Mission of Mār Ammō. Of the Parthian version only a few scraps have survived: two were made available by F. W. K. Mueller,² M 48 (dealing with the Tūrān-Šāh³) and M 566. Three further pieces which belonged to the same manuscript as M 48 and M 566, make up the fragment M 216; two of its pieces which contained a text parallel to the Middle Persian version, were published together with it⁴; the third which although terribly mutilated is perhaps the most interesting, is given here for the first time:

M 216 b⁵

Caption R]cy fryštgrywšn ... of the Apostle of Light
V fryštgrywšn [... the Apostle of Light

Recto

1	fry]štg p'dgyrb	[he saw] the figure of the Apostle
2] 'wd prw'n qft	and fell on his face and became
3	['wd 'by']wš bwd u mrdwlm'n	unconscious. The people
4]n bwd 'hynd oo 'dy'n	were[amazed]. Thereupon
5	p'dw]h'd kw'm'n	[they] prayed: to us
6] 'h oo oo	...
7	y]yšw'	Jesus ...
8] 'm oo	we shall

1 *Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan* (abbrev. *Mir. Man.*), ii, 301-306.

2 *Handschriftenreste*, ii, 86-88.

3 See *ZDMG.*, 90, 7.

4 *Mir.Man.*, ii, 301-304.

5 [square brackets] indicate letters and words missing in the manuscript (restored by the editor).

Verso

9 <i>dyn'n 'mæg pð wryb[yh]</i>	...he overcame the teachings of the
10 <i>bzg 'ndrynj'd[oo oo]</i>	(other) religions by their own evil.
11 <i>hbz' wryw'n š[h w'xt]</i>	HBZA, the Waručān-Š[āh said:
12 <i>kwe 'ym kð'm wy['w 'r 'st]</i>	what is all this talk about?
13 <i>o 'wed w'xtynd k[w</i>	They said: it is ...
14 <i>'st byc [</i>	but ...
15 <i>hbz' p[</i>	HBZA ...
16 <i>'š[</i>	...
17 <i>h[</i>	...

Since this scrap was found in close proximity to the other two pieces registered as M 216, there can be no doubt that its contents refer either to the mission under Addai and Patecius, or the mission under Mār Ammō. The latter is more likely by far, in view of the absence of any mention of a Waručān-Šāh in any of the three descriptions of the western mission which are available. This opinion seems to be supported by a further fragment of the Parthian manuscript to which M 48, M 216, and M 566 belonged*. This is a double folio registered as T i x (=M 1306 in my numbering); one of its folios deals with the Tūrān-Šāh, the other is given here:

Recto

1 . .]š hr[...
2 <i>qryd oo 'w[</i>	makes. To ...
3 <i>'st' w'd '[</i>	praised ...
4 <i>'wed 'w bg'rd[</i>	And Bag-Ard ...
5 <i>pwrš'd hym [</i>	I asked ...
6 <i>jyryft cy bg[</i>	the wisdom of Bag[-Ard?†
7 <i>dšn pdgryft '[</i>	I took her right hand
8 <i>'wed 'c prw'[n</i>	and [left] her presence.
9 <i>[p]š šwed 'hym [</i>	Thereafter I went to
10 <i>[š]hrys[t'n</i>	the city of ...‡

6 With the help of the originals it may be possible to produce complete pages of these and a few other fragments.

7 Or "the wisdom of the gods"?

8 A tantalizing lacuna!

Verso

11]p .'.[.....
12	r]ngs	shortly.....
13]ʾwd 'z 'w	.And I [went] to.....
14	h]ym o br'dr'n	The brethren.....
15]cg° cw'gwn dyd	when I saw.....
16]g z'wr rhyrn 'w	the improvement ¹⁰ of strength
17	[šhr cy w]rwc šwd hym	I went to [the country of Wa]ruč
18	wy]šmn'd oo 'b'w	...was glad. Thereupon...
19]ʾwyšt'd hym o	I stood...
20]'.n b[.....

It seems necessary to have the name of a country or a town in line 17, and so it is natural to restore]rwc (in itself a common Parthian word, = "day") to [w]rwc = Waruč. We have now to consider the question: where lay the country of Waruč whose king was called Waručān-Šāh?

Mār Ammō's mission was directed principally to Abaršahr, i.e. Nisapur¹¹, from where he proceeded to Marv¹². The Sogdian version of the Missionary History describes his success in the following terms: "And.....Abaršahr and Marv (ʾbrš'r ZY mr [γ]).....he did manifold...for the profit of the religion. He ordained numerous kings and rulers, grandees and noblemen, queens and ladies, princes and princesses. He fully exposed the Buddhahship of the Prophet of Light (i.e. Mani). He completed and fulfilled all orders and injunctions that [had been given] him by [Mani]". These sentences which are omitted in the Middle Persian version, conclude the surviving portion of the Sogdian story, except for an anticipatory caption over the last page: mr'mw c'ukw kwš'my pyr [= "How Mār Ammō [came to] the frontier post of Kushan". On the other hand, Mār Ammō's adventures at the "frontier post of Kushan", where he met a somewhat unsympathetic spirit¹³ whose name was Bag-Ard¹⁴,

9 Possibly pd]ycg.

10 Abstract noun (ending -wn as in Sogdian) from why "better."

11 *Mir.Man.*, ii, 303; *ZDMG.*, 90, 8.

12 His journey to Zamb on the Oxus (*Mir.Man.*, iii, 858; *ZDMG.*, 90, 8) took place much later, after Mani's death. It has no immediate connection with the events described in the Missionary History.

13 The common MPers. word for "spirit, ghost" (*wāxš*) has been confused with the name of the Oxus (*wāxš*) by Schaefer, *Iranica*, 76.

14 On this name see now H.W. Bailey, *Zoroastrian problems in the ninth-century books*, 67 sqq. It could also be read as *Bagārd*. It is not impossible

are detailed in the Middle Persian version which in its turn breaks off in the middle of the story.

The two Parthian fragments published here continue the story. M 1306 comes first: Mār Ammō succeeds in reconciling the spirit Bag-Ard who at first was refusing him admittance into the countries whose frontier she guarded, i.e. the Kushan country, the western part of which was at that time (about 265-270 A.D.) a dependency of the Sassanian state. Or more prosaically expressed: Mār Ammō, after some difficulties, succeeded in entering the Kushan country. After passing the frontier, he went to the city of X. (name lost in the manuscript) where he organised a Manichaean community. When it was well established (lines 14-16), he proceeded to the country of Waruč. The story is taken up by M 216 b now: with the help of miracles etc. Mār Ammō becomes the talk of the country, and in the end the attention of HBŽ' (*Havazā*?), the Waručān-Šāh, is drawn to his activities.

Unfortunately we do not know for certain where the "frontier post of Kushan" (i.e. the frontier between Khorasan and the then Persian dependency of Kushan) was situated in the third century¹⁵. But we may conjecture that it lay in the same district where in the succeeding centuries the frontier between the Sassanian state and the Kushan/Hephthalite country was established, namely (according to Marquart) at Tālaqān, halfway between Marv-i-Rōd and Pāryāb (Daulet-ābād). It would thus appear probable that the country of Waruč lay in or close to Gōzganān and Gharčistān, or at any rate to the south-west of Balkh. It is interesting to notice that a town of that region, Žimat, is mentioned in a Manichaean Sogdian text, in connexion with the Kushano-Sogdian goddess Nana¹⁶; that the name of the town βαγ'α'ρδα (Ptolemy, 6,8,15) is connected; Darmesteter compared it with Avestan *Vaēkarata*.

¹⁵ Cf. Schaeder, *Iranica*, 75.

¹⁶ See my article in the forthcoming number of the *JRAS.*, 1944, part 3. It is, however, doubtful that the name in the tax-list Ibn Khurdadbih, 37,9, represents Žimat as claimed by Marquart, *Ērānšahr* 227. As it occurs after Wāšgird Marquart was forced to the assumption that the original order of the list had been disturbed; this can no longer be maintained if Minorsky is right in placing 'Andamīn (?) in the Lesser Pamir (*Hudūd al-'Ālam*, 332 sq.). But possibly the name of Žimat can be recognized in the mysterious رعد خوره *ws'dxrh*, Ibn Khurdadbih 36,17, of which the second part undoubtedly represents جز *jz*h = *Ĵazza*, *Gaza*, *Gčak* (not noticed by Marquart, 218, but cf. p. 86), while the former could be restored as زيمد *zymd* = *Zīmad*.

this town lay, according to Huan-ts'ang, "south-west from Balkh in a corner of the Snowy Mountains."

Let us now consider what evidence we can glean from non-Manichaean sources. Most important perhaps is the reference to a Waručān-Šāh (*wlwc'n MLK'*) in the Great Inscription of Šapur I (end of line 29) which was set up in A.D. 262 (according to my calculations)¹⁷, about the time when Mār Ammō set out on his journey to the Eastern countries. He is mentioned close to the beginning of the long list of dignitaries who contributed to the success of Šapur's reign¹⁸, after the king of Mosul (Norsirakan), the king of Kerman, and the Queen of Mesene, but his name cannot be read with certainty: *dstklt šhpwhry 'mēspy* (?); possibly *Amačasp* was his personal name, and *Dastkert-Šāhpuhr* an additional honorific name given to him by Šapur¹⁹. This Amačasp may have been the predecessor of Havazā whom Mār Ammō met (assuming that HBZ' was a personal name and not a title). It is true that the inscription gives no clue to the location of the Waručān-Šāh²⁰; but it indicates that this prince ruled over a country somewhere at the confines of Iran, and that in the third century he was a vassal of some importance. We may also recognize the title of Waručān-Šāh in the *برجانشاه*: *Br'j'n-š'h* (*Baručān-Šāh*) who in the list of "the kings whom Ardashir called *šāh*" (Ibn Khurdadbih, 17, 7) is named after the *Kādiš-Šāh*, the ruler of Herat (or districts near Herat)²¹.

According to the strict rules of the Armenian language, *Waručān* would appear as *Varčan* in Armenian. Such a name does indeed occur in the *Armenian Geography*, in the list of the provinces of the East²²). There we find the following enumeration: *Peroz-naxčir*, *Dzin-Avazak* (var. *dzinuazak*, *dzinazak*), *Varčan* (var. *Varjan*), *Manšan*, *Gčak*, *Asan*, *Bahli-bamik*. The name of *Peroz-naxčir* survives in present-day *Pir-Naxčir* (24 kilometres south of Taškur-

17 See BSOS., ix, 845.

18 In an article contributed to the *Jackson Memorial Volume* I have given a full analysis of the passage. It was sent to Bombay early in 1939, but has not so far been published.

19 Although such a name would appear suitable to a castle rather than to a prince.

20 As a matter of curiosity we may mention that Sprengling apparently took Waručān for Baloches (*AJSL*, lii, 1937, p. 142).

21 Differently Marquart, *loc. cit.*, 31.

22 Marquart, *loc. cit.*, 9.

gan, 12 km. west of Hazret-Sultan²³). *Manšan* (*Mānišān*) represents the Māk valley according to Professor Minorsky²⁴), *Gčak* lay due south of Balkh, *Asan* in the south-eastern corner of Gōzganān, while *Dzin-Avazak* or *Dzi-Navazak* is said to be a name imported from mythology²⁵). The sequence of names proves, I think, that *Varčān*, too, should be looked for to the south or south-west of Balkh²⁶), precisely in that region over part of which the Waručān-Šāh held sway.

To sum up: in the third century there was a country called Waruč or Waručān which lay in the Kushan country just beyond the traditional border of Persia, but had been incorporated in the Sassanian state under Ardashir or (more likely) Shapur I. It adjoined the country of the Kadishaeans and the valleys formed by the affluents of the Upper Murghāb. Its king was influential enough to be mentioned alongside the rulers of such important provinces as Mosul, Kerman, and Mesene. But in later times its name seems to have disappeared from history. There can be little doubt that the country of Waruč is the same as that known in later centuries as Gharch or Gharchistān, while the possibility that *yarč* is merely a later form²⁷ of the word *waruč* cannot be ruled out.

23 Cf. also Marquart, *loc. cit.*, 81 sq.

24 *Hudūd al-'Alam*, 334

25 Thus Marquart, *Ērānšahr*, 82 sq.; *Wchrot*, 143 sqq.; *Catalogue*, 34 sqq. But cf. Minorsky, *loc. cit.*, 185 sq. Possibly originally *Diz-i (H) avazā* "the castle of HBZ," corrupted under the influence of *Diz-i Avāze*?

26 Marquart thought of Warwāliz (Qunduz).

27 In disyllables with two brief vowels and not more than three consonants the second vowel is liable to elision in several Iranian languages, especially if the middle consonant is a continuant, cf. e.g. Persian *lang* "lame" from *lamak*, *pahn* from *paθan*; Middle Persian *bašn* "temple" from *bažin*; Parthian *bašn* "part, limb" from *bažin*; Parachi *pač* "before" from *patiš*. Thus *waruč* provided the -ū- was brief, could become *warč*. Initial *w-* becomes *γ-* (*gh-*) regularly in Parachi, a dialect to which the old language of Gharchistan was presumably closely related. This change occurs sporadically also in other dialects, see Morgenstierne, *Indo-Iranian Frontier Languages*, I. 9.

Virampatnam

By R. E. M. Wheeler

Virampatnam lies on the east coast two miles south of Pondicherry, in French India. At first sight, this peaceful village of fisherfolk is scarcely an appropriate vehicle for the commemoration of one who shared the dust of the Gobi wilderness with the shade of Hiuen Tsang and, like Alexander, scaled the peak of Aornos. But in its own degree the exploration of Virampatnam is likely to open, or at least to chart, some part of an obscure field of knowledge, and so may claim a faint affinity with the more adventurous pioneering of him to whose memory the present compilation is dedicated.

The obscure field of knowledge referred to is the earlier archæology of southern India. Few parts of Asia can be richer in remains of prehistoric and early historic cultures than is the great expanse of Archaean rocks which extends southwards of a line from Goa to the lower Ganges and bears, *inter alia*, most of the megaliths and urn-fields of India. Few regions so populous and accessible have at the same time been submitted to so little scientific exploration. It is high time that Indian archaeology took up the task with method and determination, and the environs of the village which gives its name to this note offer a tempting opportunity.

Half a mile behind the village, and sheltered now from the sea by dunes and palm-trees, the site of an ancient town is being gradually swept away by the Ariyankuppam at a point where the river swings northwards to its estuary. Brick foundations are being carved out of its eastern bank, and sherds and other débris litter the adjacent land-surface. As far back as the 18th century, Le Gentil mentions these or similar remains, and records a Tamil tradition that the site was that of the fort of Raja Vira-Raguen and the ancient town of Virampatnam.¹ Thereafter it was not until 1929 that the place began to attract the attention of the antiquary. In that year the Rev. Brother R. F. Faucheux, of the Petit Séminaire at Pondicherry, and Mons. N. Lafitte, then Chef du Service de la Pharmacie, collected semi-precious stones, glass and other objects from the surface. The villagers followed suit, and found amongst other things an intaglio representing the head of Augustus. This was bought

1. *Voyage dans les mers des Indes à l'occasion du passage de Vénus sur le disque du Solin* (Paris, 1779-81), I, 542-5.

by Mons. G. Jouveau-Dubreuil, and was subsequently removed with other relics to the Musée de l' École Française d'Extrême-Orient at Hanoi, Indo-China. Meanwhile, Mons. Jouveau-Dubreuil invited Dr. A. Aiyappan² and Professor K. A. Nilakanta Sastri³ from Madras to visit the site, and limited excavations were carried out in 1941-2 under the supervision of Brother Faucheux and Mr. P.Z. Pattabiraman.

In these excavations, the levels at which objects were found were noted with considerable care with reference to an arbitrary datum-line (mean sea level), and this record, as written on certain of the actual objects, is of provisional use in grouping them roughly in bulk. The facts appear to be as follows:—

(i) Beneath two strata of brick structures of uncertain plan and date, and at a depth of nearly two feet below mean sea level and some twenty feet below the average ground level, is a stratum containing imported Roman pottery, notably amphorae and red-glazed Arretine ware, the latter datable to circa A.D. 1-50.⁴ Other Roman wares and romanising local pottery occur at the same depth, together with purely local products occasionally stamped with the Naga and other symbols. A few sherds bear graffiti in a Brahmi script which has been ascribed by Dr. B. C. Chhabra, of the Archaeological Survey of India, on epigraphical grounds to 200 B.C.-A.D. 200. The graffiti are mostly fragmentary and are difficult to interpret, but deserve further study. Save perhaps in two instances, the language is Monumental Prakrit.

(ii) From the same level, and possibly others also, has been derived an extensive series of beads made from quartz, amethyst, topaz, agate, jasper, carnelian, and glass, together with unworked and partially worked stones. The site was very clearly a focus for the semi-precious stone trade and related industries. One type of bead in particular is significant: the so-called "collared barrel" which is distributed

2 Dr. Aiyappan subsequently contributed an article on the site to the *Hindu* newspaper, Weekly Magazine Section, Madras, 23rd March, 1941.

3 K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, "An inscribed potsherd from Arikamedu," *Journal of the Madras University*, XIV, No. 1. The name "Arikamedu" is that given to the site by some of the local villagers, but otherwise has no known authority.

4 The Arretine ware includes Ritterling type 5 and Dragendorff types 16, 17 and possibly 11. There are also hard buff imitations, evidently imported, of Dragendorff type 24/25.

widely in India and is found also in the eastern Mediterranean area.⁵ At Taxila in the Punjab the type occurs in deposits dating from the third century B. C. to the first century A. D., and it is found on Andhra sites in Hyderabad State (see below).

(iii) The discovery of an untrimmed quartz intaglio representing Cupid and a bird suggests that Mediterranean gem-cutters were employed on the site.

Briefly, even on the fragmentary evidence at present available the site qualifies sufficiently for the status of *emporium* which Ptolemy in fact accords to it if we accept its identity with his *Podouke emporion* (VII, 1, 14).⁶

In a preliminary note written before the excavations of 1941 and before the finding of the Arretine pottery, Mons. Jouveau-Dubreuil had already hailed the discovery or re-discovery of the site in no uncertain fashion. "Nous avons là une véritable ville romaine", he exclaimed. "Ce site n'est pas d'intérêt local ni même d'Inde et même de l'Asie; nous avons là des ruines romaines. Et l'étude de ce site inscrirait une nouvelle page dans l'histoire romaine".⁷ A colder and more calculated appreciation of the possibilities might have substituted "footnote" for "page"; the page had in fact already been written by the numerous classical historians and topographers who refer to Romano-Indian trade and markets, and by modern writers who have catalogued Roman coins found in India.⁸ But it is neither as a new page nor even as a new footnote to Roman history that I now signalize the importance of Virampatnam. It is rather as the preface to a new text-book of southern Indian archaeology. Let me amplify this.

The Arretine ware, now recognized for the first time in India, has given a fresh precision to the dating of the earlier part of the site. It is clear that the stratum from which the sherds and at any

5 See H. C. Beck, "Classification and nomenclature of beads and pendants", *Archaeologia*, LXXVII (London, 1927); and "The beads from Taxila," *Memoirs of the Archaeological Survey of India*, No. 65 (Delhi, 1941).

6 E. H. Warnington, *The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (Cambridge, 1928), p. 62; G. Jouveau-Dubreuil in *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient*, XL. (1941), 449. Discussion of this identification cannot be carried further without fresh evidence.

7 *Bulletin*, p. 450.

8 A fresh recension of the evidence for Roman coins in India has been prepared by Mr. T. G. Aravamuthan of Madras, and will be published by the Government Museum, Madras.

rate some of the beads came was accumulating not later than A.D. 50, and may be upwards of half a century earlier. The complex of bead-forms and stones is distinctive, and it is not peculiar to Virampatnam. An identical assemblage occurs on two sites in the State of Hyderabad; namely Kondapur, 40 miles west-north-west of Hyderabad, and Maski, 150 miles south-west of the city. At these sites preliminary excavations have been carried out by the State Department of Archaeology, and a layer dated by local coins to the Andhra period (late B. C. to A. D. 250) has been identified in association with a bead-industry, including the collared barrel type, similar to that of Virampatnam. In this layer at Kondapur occurs also a curious series of clay *bullae*, copied from early Roman imperial coins, sometimes with garbled inscription,⁹ and one actual coin, said to be of Augustus, has been found elsewhere on the site. It may be added that in the whole of Hyderabad State only one other Roman coin-find is recorded. Consistently with this scarcity of intrusive coinage, the pottery, at any rate at Kondapur where I have seen a considerable quantity, is devoid of Roman admixture.

The picture, if we may paint one with so limited a palette, is thus an intelligible one. In the interior of the country we have in the first century B.C. and the first and second centuries A.D. a powerful Indian kingdom, that of the Andhras, stretching across the northern Deccan and jealously controlling a number of gem-stone sources. On the coast are the emporia for foreign trade, some of them with a nucleus of Mediterranean settlers.¹⁰ Souvenirs of the foreigner find their way occasionally into the interior, but the only real cultural link between the kingdom and the foreign element in the coastal markets is the pervading craft of the gem-stone cutter. Archaeologically, the type-fossil of the period is the bead, and it is on a careful study of bead-forms that South Indian archaeology of this phase is most likely to make its first advances.

South of the Andhras the position in the first two centuries A.D. appears to have been more fluid. On the east the Colas, on the west the Ceras, and at the southern end the Pāṇḍyas were jockeying

9 I am informed by Mr. Ajit Mookerjee that similar sub-Roman *bullae* of clay and bronze have been found on an ancient urban site between Dhauli hill and Bhubaneswar in Orissa. Mr. Mookerjee identifies this site with the Mauryan city of Tosala or Tosali.

10 In addition to Virampatnam, reference may be made to the Temple of Augustus which the Peutinger Table locates at Muziris, commonly identified with Cranganore on the coast of Cochin.

for position, with the Colas (in whose territory Virampatnam may be included) vaguely in the lead. The absence of strong centralised control in this region appears to have opened the way to a more intensive penetration of Roman prospectors or at any rate of Roman currency, for Roman coins are here found freely in the interior (e.g. in the Coimbatore district) as well as along the coast.

Such briefly would appear to be the general situation from the point of view of the student of the Roman exploitation of *India gemmifer*. But, as I have already implied, the importance to us of this commerce in stones lies less in the impact of Roman enterprise than in the impact of Roman chronology. The possibilities of this new factor cannot yet be foretold. At Virampatnam itself an extensive Indian culture found in contact with the imported goods awaits checking and analysis, and will thereafter be the first early South Indian culture for which a close dating is feasible. At the same time, further afield there are other possibilities. Both at Maski and at Kondapur a few sherds of a very distinctive and widespread ware have been found, as I am told, in the Andhra level. This ware is of a rich russet colour with simple parallel lines or waves in a thin yellow slip under a glossy surface. I am credibly informed that this ware has also been unearthed as a primary deposit in a sealed large-cist grave (or dolmen buried below the surface) in Cochin, and I have picked it up on ancient town or village mounds at Vellalur and at Nathamedu near Bogampatti, in the Coimbatore district.¹¹ Whether it actually occurs at Virampatnam remains to be seen; but the evidence appear to indicate that it was widely current round about the beginning of the present era, and that, incidentally, a dominant type of megalithic tomb was in use at the same time. If this be so—and much further evidence is required—we shall for the first time have a firm base for the study of Indian megaliths.

I would again, however, emphasise that these preliminary notes merely indicate lines of research and do not profess to map assured discovery. For that, much hard work of a pioneer kind is still required, and will shortly be initiated.

11 A hoard of "silver Roman coins" is recorded to have been found at Vellalur. Nathamedu is a new discovery, 1944; a low hill upwards of 1000 yards in diameter is thickly littered with potsherds and iron slag.

Some References to Kaṭāha Dvīpa in Ancient Indian Literature

By Dr. V. S. Agrawala

Kaṭāha Dvīpa is mentioned several times in Sanskrit and Prakrit literature as a place situated beyond the sea and reached by ships leaving the sea-port of Tāmraliptī. In Prakrit its name occurs as Kaḍāhadīpa. In the inscriptions of Rājārāja Cola and Rājendra Cola giving an account of their naval conquests, the name of Kaḍāram occurs as one of the several places of the East Indian Archipelago. Both Kaḍāram and Kaṭāha have been identified with Keḍah in the North West of the Malaya peninsula.

In the *Kathāsaritsāgara* several stories refer to sea-voyages undertaken to Suvarṇadvīpa and Kaṭāhadvīpa for purposes of trade. The parable of the *Agurudāhī* trader¹ says that a foolish merchant took a ship-load of black *aguru* wood as merchandise to be sold in the Kaṭāhadvīpa. The people of the land did not know the stuff, and thus not being able to sell it the merchant converted it into charcoal. Bragging of his cleverness in thus earning money, the fellow only exposed his folly.

In another Prakrit work, the *Samarāiccakāhā* by Haribhadra Sūri, written about the middle of the 8th century, there are two stories relating to Kaṭāhadvīpa. In one of them² the sea journey is described in detail. A rich merchant named Dhana, living inland, first went to Tāmraliptī, but did not make sufficient money from the disposal of his ware. This strengthened his resolution to earn increased profit by going in for maritime commerce. It is stated that sea-faring merchants in those days were earning much more profit than inland traders. The merchant then equipped a ship with such goods as were being exported from India to the Eastern Islands and set sail with a faithful servant and his wife who proved herself faithless. As a result of her giving poisoned food, the merchant got ill, but continued the journey, till at last the boat reached the shore of Mahā-Kaṭāha-Dvīpa. Fearing mishap to his own life, he put his servant Nandaka in charge of the goods; the servant went ashore with presents to the king of the place who allotted him a place of residence. Arranging for medical relief to his master, but seeing no improvement of his condition, Nandaka hurriedly disposed of the goods and purchasing other importable goods started on the return journey to the mother country. On the way the ailing

1 *Kathāsaritsāgara*, CO. 2-6.

2 *Samarāiccakāhā*, ed. Jacobi, pp. 195-206.

husband was pushed into the sea by the treacherous wife. After instituting a fruitless search for the merchant, Nandaka perforce continued his homeward journey. Fortunately the merchant caught hold of a floating plank from a previous ship-wreck and after struggling in water for several days was stranded ashore.

Another story in the same book³ also refers to a sea voyage on business errand from Tāmraliptī to Kaṭāhadvīpa. Aruṇadeva, the merchant prince of Tāmraliptī started on a ship loaded with merchandise from that sea-port and sailed for Kaṭāhadvīpa. Unfortunately his ship was caught in a storm and lost. But the merchant got support on a loose plank and was able to reach the shore.

In the *Brhat-kathāmañjarī*⁴ of the poet Kṣemendra the story of the virtuous lady Devasmitā refers to Kaṭākṣadvīpa, which is no doubt the same as the Kaṭāhadvīpa of other works. Dhanagupta is a merchant of Tāmraliptā. He once went with his son on a sea voyage to the Barbara country and there besought the hand of a beautiful maiden for his son. Although her father did not agree, she herself became enamoured of the merchant's son and came with them. Their marriage was celebrated on their return to Tāmraliptā. After his father's death Guhasena embarked from the port of Tāmraliptā on a sea-voyage for the increase of wealth. Before starting he obtained from Siva a pair of lotus flowers one of which he gave to his wife, while he kept the other with himself. The flower would keep its freshness so long as the couple remained steadfast in their virtue. Leaving his faithful wife behind, he after many days reached the Kaṭākṣa-dvīpa. There in an assembly of friends he spoke of his wife and the lotus flower. Four of them thought of testing her virtue and came to Tāmraliptā. Each made his advance to Devasmitā, but was worsted in wit and disgraced. The virtuous lady then fearing harm to her husband from them left for Kaṭākṣa-dvīpa in the guise of a merchant. Arriving at the place, she appraised the king of the whole affair. The king thereupon captured the miscreants and united her to her husband. The couple returned to Tāmraliptā bringing with them great treasure.

These stories incorporated in the Kathā literature of the mediaeval period (8th to 11th centuries A.D.) show the popularity of the name Kaṭāha-dvīpa which appears to have frequently come to the minds of the story-writers as part of the *motif* of naval voyages undertaken by adventurous merchants during the flourishing period of India's international commerce.

3 Ibid p. 585

4 II 183. p. 60

Editorial Notes

In October 1944 the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society unanimously elected Dr. Syamaprasad Mookerjee, M.A., D.Litt., Bar-at-Law, M.L.A. as its President in place of the lamented Sir P. C. Ray. The Managing Committee of the Society is grateful to Dr. Mookerjee for kindly accepting the appointment with effect from the same month. The Committee takes this opportunity to welcome Dr. R. E. Mortimer Wheeler, D. Litt., Director-General of Archaeology who has been elected as one of the Vice-Presidents of the Society.

The first Deccan History Conference is due to be held at Hyderabad, (Dn.) on the successive days, 10th to 12th April 1945. The Conference will have as its General President Mr. W. V. Grigson, Revenue Member, H.E.H. the Nizam's Government. There will also be three sections, the Ancient, the Mediaeval and the Modern, of which Dewan Bahadur S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar Professor Haroun Khan Sherwani and Rao Bahadur C. S. Srinivasachari will act as respective Presidents. The Greater India Society has sent its best wishes to the authorities of the Conference for the success which they so richly deserve.

The Greater India Society welcomes the advent of the Archaeological Society of South India under the distinguished patronage of the Vice-Chancellor, Madras University. The Society has made a promising beginning by publishing as its first Memoir the monograph "*Epigraphical Echoes of Kālidāsa*" written by the well-known Curator of the Archaeological Section of the Madras Government Museum, Mr. C. Sivaramamurti. We shall be glad to notice this book in the next number of this Journal.

Owing to limitations of space imposed by the existing rules, the Managing Committee of the Greater India Society regrets that the sections on book-reviews and select contents of Oriental Journals have to be unavoidably held over till the next number of this Journal. The Committee equally regrets the delay in the appearance of this number of the Journal due to the present abnormal situation.

Obituary Notice.

The late Sir Prafulla Chandra Ray, Kt., C.I.E., D.Sc.

In the last number of this Journal we had the melancholy duty of mourning the death of the late President of the Greater India Society, Sir Prafulla Chandra Ray, who has been rightly acclaimed as one of the greatest Indians of his generation, eminent as a teacher and scholar, as an inspirer of industrial advance in this country, as a philanthropist, and as a man of sterling character. In the present number we give a short sketch of his remarkable career which, it is not too much to say, will serve as a beacon of inspiration to untold generations of his countrymen.

Born on August 2, 1861 in a family of moderate means in an obscure village in the Khulna district of Bengal, Prafulla Chandra Ray was educated successively at the Hare and Albert schools and the Metropolitan Institution, Calcutta. Winning the Gilchrist scholarship of his year, he joined the University of Edinburgh in 1882. There he stayed till 1888 when he obtained the D.Sc. degree of that University on a thesis in Inorganic Chemistry. Returning to India, he was appointed Assistant Professor of Chemistry at the Presidency College, Calcutta, in 1889, and he continued his connection with that college till his retirement in 1916. During these years of strenuous service he not only established his reputation as a very successful teacher of his subject, but also published a large number of original papers, and above all, helped to build an Indian school of chemists which has since won international recognition. Indeed, it is not too much to say, that along with his colleague in the branch of Physics, the late Sir J. C. Bose, he helped to win a place for his countrymen in the estimation of the world of science in modern times. To the same active period of his life belongs the publication of his great work entitled *History of Hindu Chemistry* in two volumes (1902, 1908), which was immediately hailed by discerning critics as a contribution of first-rate importance to the history of chemical science. During the same years he took an active part in founding the *Bengal Chemical and Pharmaceutical Works Ltd.*, which under his fostering care rapidly developed into one of the largest manufacturers of indigenous drugs on this side of India. It is melancholy to reflect that with all his qualifications, he failed to be admitted into the permanent cadre of the Indian Educational Service, though his eminence was recognised by the award of the high distinction of Companion of the Order of the Indian Empire in 1911.

Retiring from Government service, he was immediately appointed at the instance of that great educationist, the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, the first Palit Professor of Chemistry at the University College of Science and Technology, Calcutta. This post he held with high credit till 1936 when he retired for reasons of health. In the congenial atmosphere of the University he was able to increase his research activities still further. What is more, he benefited the University immensely by his princely donations, derived from savings from his salary, in the cause of the science which he loved so well. Out of these endowments, the University has been able to found two Sir P. C. Ray Research Fellowships in Chemistry, the Nagarjuna Research Prize in Chemistry, and the Sir Asutosh Mookerjee Research Prize in Zoology and Botany. His invaluable services to the University were fittingly recognised by his appointment as Emeritus Professor after his retirement, a position which he held till his death.

In this last period of his career Sir Prafulla Chandra Ray—he was knighted just after the last Great War—earned the heartfelt love and gratitude of his countrymen by actively encouraging numerous industrial undertakings started by educated Bengali youngmen, and still more, by his untiring efforts to relieve the misery of the people on the occasions of awful visitations of nature, like the Khulna famine of 1921 and the North Bengal Flood of 1922.

Schooling himself from the first to a life of almost ascetic simplicity—he remained a bachelor all his life—Prafulla Chandra gave away his surplus income in minor charities too numerous to mention. The Greater India Society which was fortunate enough to have him as its President for a number of years, profited not only by his sage advice, but also by his generous patronage.

A man of fine literary taste, the late Sir P. C. Ray delighted in the study of Shakespeare, Emerson and Carlyle, as also of Rabindranath Tagore. His fascinating autobiography, written in his characteristic terse idiomatic style, which was called *Life and Experiences of a Bengali Chemist*, was published in two volumes (1932, 1935).

In his last years Sir P. C. Ray suffered from an almost complete breakdown of his health, but he retained his interest in all progressive movements of his countrymen, passing away peacefully in his room at the University College of Science—his home for the last thirty years of his life—on June 16, 1944.

May his soul rest in peace!

Additions to our Library

The Greater India Society acknowledges with thanks the receipt of the following periodicals, books, pamphlets etc. since the last notice in *JGIS.*, Vol. X, No. 1.

Administration Report of the Archaeological Department. Government of Travancore. 1118 M.E. Trivandrum 1944.

Adyar Library Bulletin, Brahma-vidyā, Vol. vii, Parts 3-4; Vol. viii, Parts 1-4; Vol. ix, Part 1.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. Vol. xxiv, Parts 3-4.

Bhāratiya Vidyā Patrikā. Vol. ii (concluded), Vol. iii (in progress).

Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Vol. iv, Nos. 3-4; Vol. v, No. 1.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies. Vol. xi, Parts 1-2.

Columbia University Bulletin of Information. Report of the President of the Columbia University for 1944.

Indian Historical Quarterly. Vol. xix, Nos. 3-4; Vol. x, Nos. 1-4.

Journal of Āndhra History and Culture, Vol. i, No. 3.

Journal of Annamalai University. Vol. xii, No. 1.

Journal of the Assam Research Society, Vol. x, Nos. 1-4.

Journal of the Ganganath Jha Research Institute. Vol. i, Parts 2-4; Vol. ii, Part 1.

Journal of Indian History: Vol. xxiii, Parts 1-2,

Journal of the Śrī Venkateśvara Oriental Institute. Vol. iv, No. 2; Vol. v, Nos. 1-2.

Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society. Vol. xvi, Parts 1-2.

Nāgarī Prachārini Patrikā. Vol. xlvii, Parts 3-4.

Pitt, A. J. *A Short Study of the Hindu and Muslim Minds and their Reaction to Politics.* Luzac & Co., London, 1944.

Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society. Vol. xxxv, No. 1.

Sivaramamurti, C. *Epigraphical Echoes of Kālidāsa.* Memoirs of the Archaeological Society of South India. Madras, 1944.

University of Ceylon Review. Vol. i, No. 2; Vol. ii, Nos. 1-2,

